PB-228 207

A CRASH COURSE IN ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION

Environment Protection Agency
Chicago, Illinois

July 1971

DISTRIBUTED BY:

NTIS

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield Va. 22151

PB 228 207

INTRODUCTION

This booklet is for citizens and groups directly involved in environmental action, for those experienced in the difficulties of organizing and sustaining citizen participation on public issues of environmental concern.

It is the transcript of a one-day crash course in environmental action held in Chicago on May 17, 1971.

The participants represent some of the most successful eco-action groups in Mid-America.

SCOPE hopes you will be able to use much of their thinking to help better the role of your group in working within the democratic process.

Student Council on Pollution
and Environment
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1 North Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U S Department of Commerce
Springfield VA 22151

203

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Opening Remarks page 2

2. Review of Citizen/Student Involvement 7
Avery Taylor, Environmental Action

3. Who to See, Where to Go -- The Administrative End 22
Louise Rome, Ill. League of Women Voters

4. Getting Congressional Help 47
Ron Way, Legislative Assistant to Senator Gaylord Nelson

5. Going to Court 78
Alexander Polikoff, Businessmen for the Public Interest

6. Community Organization 103
Lee Botts, Open Lands Project

7. Direct Confrontation 127
Robert Creamer, Campaign Against Pollution

8. Dealing with the Media 148
Harlan Draeger, Chicago Daily News
Donn Pearlman, WBBM(Chicago) Radio News
Ron Dorfman, Chicago Journalism Review

9. Case Study: Northwestern Students for a Better Environment 167
Warren Muir

10. Case Study: Pallisades Project 185
Myron M. Cherry, Attorney at Law

PROCEEDINGS

MR. CORRADO: We would like to start right now, realizing the fact that there are a lot of people caught in traffic at the moment, and we may be running a little behind. There may be people coming in for the next hour, but we have to start right on schedule, since there is a full program here for today.

My name is Frank Corrado; I am with the Environmental Protection Agency here in Chicago. The purpose of today's program is to, in essence, offer for the first time a crash program in environmental education for leaders in environmental activities.

The program is being sponsored by the Student Council on Pollution and Environment, a student group that works in conjunction with the Federal government.

I would like to introduce Mr. Jack Lawlor, who is one of the newer members of SCOPE, the Student Council on Pollution and Environment, and he is going to give the opening remarks this morning. He will introduce our first speaker, Miss Avery Taylor, from Environmental Action in Washington.

Jack.

MR. LAWLOR: Well, SCOPE is glad that you could all make it. I am sure that anyone here right now is qualified to give a course in commuter tactics.

Reproduced from best available copy.

I hope you weren't personally caught up in the train strike, although I don't see how you could avoid it.

Over a century ago, Henry David Thoreau asked himself the question, "What is the use of a house if you haven't got a tolerable planet to put it on?" To be honest with ourselves, to be responsible before time and our posterity, this generation of Americans must repeatedly ask itself this same question. Our nation's leadership in several fields has resulted in almost unforeseen problems. Our phenomenal industrialization has led to intolerable levels of pollution, our understandable zeal to settle this continent has often led to hasty and unwise land use patterns.

Yet our nation claims to one other form of leadership, a 200 year record of success under the democratic form of government. If we are to maintain that leadership by preserving our heritage of political and economic freedom, it is imperative that we set out immediately to solve environmental problems, or we will soon lose our freedoms in the face of crisis.

Thoreau's question touches painfully close to the heart of an issue fundamental not only to the survival of a nation, but to an entire species. America is in such a position that we can point mankind toward either its salvation or its destruction.

Needless to say, that puts a lot of responsibility in our hands. None of you would be here today, though, if you did not accept that responsibility. So it's certainly senseless for me to go on describing the nature of the environmental problem, because we have all sensed the peculiar tragedy underlying it. We also almost undoubtedly share the same values and temperaments. I mention temperaments in particular, because those of us who are activists -- and believe me, you wouldn't have been invited here if that term didn't describe you -- those who are activists are often prone to be very involved in current issues. I hope that as we go through today's program, we will be able to use this opportunity to pause for a moment and reflect on the larger issues at hand.

Today's Environmental Action Seminar is geared to develop expertise among the corps of Chicago environmentalists that has emerged in the past year. SCOPE feels it is important to perform such services in order to keep new leaders coming.

Thanks to Mr. Frank Corrado of the Public Affairs Agency and to Roosevelt University, a permanent videotape record of today's sessions will make these proceedings available to others. Let me stress that this is a pilot project. SCOPE intends to hold similar seminars in other Great Lakes cities. For that reason we encourage your comments, suggestions and criticisms in order to improve our training sessions. This also holds for any thoughts that come to you as you engage in eco-tactics. One of SCOPE's functions is to serve as a student advisory board to the Environmental Protection Agency. Tell us your gripes, your needs, your expectations. We hope to be able to get the people in charge to listen.

We have an interesting group of people to listen to and talk with today. Avery Taylor will begin by giving us some perspectives on our current position.

As you can see on your agendas, the remainder of the day is broken down into three areas: Working Within the System, Working on the System, and Case Studies.

Louise Rome of the League of Women Voters and Ron Way of Senator Nelson's office will share thoughts on political tactics. Alexander Polikoff of the Businessmen for the Public Interest will relate what can be done with our court system.

In Area Two, Working on the System, Mrs. Lee Botts of the Lake Michigan Federation will describe a painful gap in governmental authority that may cause us to lose Lake Michigan. Pete Martinez of the

Campaign Against Pollution can tell some fine yarns of how Chicago politicians were confounded to see their constituents vigorously exercising their democratic right to demand responsive government.

Both the Lake Michigan Federation and the Campaign Against Pollution have discovered deficiencies in our current system the hard way, through experience, and for that reason their insights into what new directions must be taken are extremely valuable.

We will also meet with a distinguished panel of Chicago media people, who are naturally familiar with this most critical tool in a democracy.

We will conclude our seminar with a pair of case studies. They do two things: They serve to familiarize activists with what they should expect, and I hope they will tie together what we've learned during the day.

Before we set out on our ambitious crash course schedule, let me share one final thought with you. Most of us here are young. We've got the most at stake in the environment. Our generation has been equipped with unmatched educational opportunities, so if anyone has been prepared to meet a difficult challenge, it's us. We will be able to solve our population, energy, and water crises in rational, humane, and democratic ways only if we get an extremely early start on them. We must not fail to meet this challenge.

To paraphrase President Kennedy:

For, in a democracy, every citizen, regardless of his interest in politics, "holds office"; every one of us is in a position of responsibility, and, in the final analysis, the kind of government we get depends upon how we fulfill those responsibilities. We, the people, are the boss, and we will get the kind of environment, be it good or bad, that we demand and deserve.

At this time I would like to introduce Miss Avery Taylor.

MISS TAYLOR: I was given a specific title, A Review of Citizen/Student Involvement, and I think what I'm going to discuss is what has happened with the environmental movement in the past year.

My organization in Washington, D.C., Environmental Action, wrote the book "Earth Tool Kit." I will get it into the discussion a little bit, but if anyone has any questions about it afterward, I'd like them to ask me anything they'd like to know.

One critic recently claimed that Earth Day was nothing more than a one-day carnival created and supported by the press and media with no significant aftereffects. It may appear on the surface that many of the small changes which are beginning to show up in the individual and institutional life styles are nothing more than an amusing anecdote.

One reads that the City of New York recently purchased 365,000 reams of recycled office paper for official use.

The Delaware County chapter in Pennsylvania of the American Veterans Committee has passed a resolution opposing the 1971 convention site because it can only be reached by highways and they feel this discriminates against those who cannot drive and don't want to.

The Fox of Kane County, Illinois in his latest tactic is distributing stickers to put on bars of Dial Soap in supermarkets that say that Armour-Dial pollutes the air and pollutes our waterways.

People are beginning to know friends of friends that recycle their garbage once a week at local recycling projects.

The daily feedback to the environmental office may also seem anecdotal and insignificant. We put out a small pamphlet, "Do-It-Yourself Ecology," which contains environmental hints for the household. One woman recently called up and patiently asked if it wasn't true that industry used over 90 percent of the water in this country. Phil Michael who answered the phone said he didn't know. She then asked why we were asking housewives to plug up leaking faucets and to put bricks in their toilet, since the action was so insignificant.

Phil replied that the idea was to get the individual interested in waste and an understanding of the environmental consequences of actions. The woman then calmly explained that she was just wondering because she had put a brick in her toilet and it broke and she had just called the plumber, and she was rather annoyed about the whole thing.

Another woman called up and demanded to know what detergents staff members were using. We list phosphate levels for detergents in the book. I took the call and gave her several names. She said she was following our suggestion in our pamphlet to use soap and washing soda, and she was having to rinse the clothes three times and they were still sticky.

The same thing happens when you look at the response of industry, the onsurge of professed environmental concern by some of the major polluters. Earth Day resulted in nothing more than an extended media campaign. The can companies have announced in three full-page ads in major newspapers across the country -- some of the ads appeared twice for emphasis -- their intentions of setting up nationwide recycling centers. A closer look reveals that all they are doing is providing a single open bin on plant property, unguarded, and those that can find the bin are free to dump anything in, though cans are preferred.

This is not a tirade on any one form of container. The glass manufacturers and aluminum manufacturers are all starting recycling campaigns and spending thousands of dollars on environmental advertising.

General Motors has several television commercials in which they seriously and frankly inform their audience that they have two-thirds of the pollution problem beat, and oil companies have spent millions on mass advertising, explaining how they are cleaning up the ocean, how they are going to provide jobs for native Alaskans, how their pipelines and oil projects enhance the environment by beautiful new villages and new means of access into nature.

But underneath all of the more superficial extensions of the Earth Day fervor is a growing movement of hard-core, low-key action, certainly a significant aftereffect of April 22, 1970. The individual piecemeal efforts, so amusing by themselves, must be considered a reflection of a generalized, growing shift in attitude, which is a crucial precedent to any permanent social change which might occur. And industry certainly wouldn't be pouring funds and resources into ecological advertising if it didn't sell.

The truth is that environmental movement has had and continues to have an impact in this country, perhaps one of major substance, drawing together people from all different groups, races, sexes, classes, and ages to participate in one of the most impressive displays of sustained public action that the country has ever seen.

Everybody has to breathe the air and drink whatever water is available and move across the land in whatever transportation facilities are available, so it's not the product of one group of people.

And citizens are beginning not only to question the American shove toward technological convenience and overconsumption, but to question their own lack of public information as well, and the demand for explanations and change are coming from everywhere.

An impressive number of newsletters flow into our office every month, ranging from one-page typewritten memos to 20-page sophisticated offset publications.

We are in contact with over 1,700 groups across the country, many of which were formed after April, 1970, and all of which have expressed an interest in environmental reform. Somehow none of this leads to the conclusion that the input for Earth Day ended with a one-day display of banners and rock music.

One of the major results of Earth Day planning was to encourage a new type of active environment group, one which is fighting for positive environmental reform rather than simply conserving what is left.

This is one of the reasons that we decided to publish Earth Tool Kit, to provide a manual for the group that wanted to actively seek out reforms, how to get organized, what different battlefronts to become active on. It's becoming more and more evident that groups have to relate to specific local pollution problems and to respond to the needs of the community. These are the ones that are having more success rather than simply discussing the values of mass transit or the values of wilderness area. They are out there trying to do something as a group.

Each group is different. You come into a group with different resources, different amounts of time you can spend in donating to environmental issues. There are groups of housewives, for example, who are really well organized and meet every day from 12:00 to 3:00 when the children are in school. There are groups of students on campuses who only meet once a week but get organized with the local citizen groups in the area. There are people working outside full-time, struggling with whatever resources they can get to keep.

One of the most important things is to maintin a feedback between national lobbying groups and the grass roots local groups. We put out mailings, oh, I don't know how many times a year -- ten or twelve times a year -- to the groups explaining legislation we are for or against, and asking for them to help us, telling them what tactics are good for them to use, and the response is incredible.

If an area needs pressure and they respond at the same time and they send materials explaining the reactions of their community, what they need and their opinions of what the legislation will be able to do for this area.

Another result of Earth Day planning was the identification of environmental issues with urban as well as nature and wilderness concerns. After all, the environment with which the majority of Americans can spend in donating to environmental issues. There are groups of housewives, for example, who are really well organized and meet every day from 12:00 to 3:00 when the children are in school. There are groups of students on campuses who only meet once a week but get organized with the local citizen groups in the area. There are people working outside full-time, struggling with whatever resources they can get to keep.

One of the most important things is to maintin a feedback between national lobbying groups and the grass roots local groups. We put out mailings, oh, I don't know how many times a year -- ten or twelve times a year -- to the groups explaining legislation we are for or against, and asking for them to help us, telling them what tactics are good for them to use, and the response is incredible.

If an area needs pressure and they respond at the same time and they send materials explaining the reactions of their community, what they need and their opinions of what the legislation will be able to do for this area.

Another result of Earth Day planning was the identification of environmental issues with urban as well as nature and wilderness concerns. After all, the environment with which the majority of Americans deal is precisely the urban city environment. And possibly the most powerful tactic that has yet been utilized by environmentalists is the formation of coalitions. Farmers, laborers, housewives, conservationists, religious leaders, students and businessmen have all joined together to relate to modern urban problems of solid waste disposal, transit systems, overpopulation, air and water pollution.

Several statewide confederations of public interest groups are underway in Michigan, North Carolina, Iowa, and Arizona, to name a few.

One of the most visible benefits of a coalition is the fact that people with very different life styles and moral outlooks can cooperate in fighting for environmental reform. Cooperation among members of a traditionally conservation organization and an active student group can provide both with a more complete picture of the problem at hand and both can work on different segments of the population to convince them of needed reform or enforcement of standards.

It's interesting in Washington, D.C. that there are a lot of people that wouldn't be interested in joining Environmental Action. This is not a tax-exempt organization. It is an active young people's group compared to some of the more conservative organizations, and yet we all work together on different issues. This way you have a much larger base of implementation, working together without having to join each other's group.

The other main point about a coalition is the fact that the group with the best resources can initiate a fight and receive support from other groups in the area. If there was a wilderness suit, we wouldn't file it. The Wilderness Society in Washington would initiate the action and we would support it. A population study would probably begin with Zero Population Growth.

As environmental issues become more urban oriented, one of the most important groups to involve in a coalition is organized labor. Workers are the ones to suffer the full threats of uncontrolled technology. Not only are they the ones to be affected by the newly recognized and serious hazards of in-plant pollution, but they are also the ones subject to job relocation if their factory loses a contract or is unable or refuses to install legally required pollution control equipment.

The strict environmental arguments against the SST were almost completely overshadowed by the threat of massive unemployment at Boeing. Actually, Boeing had already greatly decreased their number of employees because of several expired defense contracts, and continuing the SST would not necessarily have brought all those laid off back to work. The full employment load quoted by SST advocates would probably not have been reached for several years.

At the same time that the SST controversy was going on, the Mass Transit Fund was cut by $200 million. This is an area where more workers could have been put into training fields. This would have been creating more jobs than we have fit into environmental reform.

Still, industry exercises a more powerful bargaining position, has a lot more money and a lot more time to spend on public relations. One of the most incredible industrial ploys recently was Union Carbide's threat to lay off 625 workers in Marietta, Ohio on the grounds that they did not have sufficient resources to install proper pollution control devices. They have since backed down on their threat. I think the EPA was investigating it.

Another thing that happens is that projects can be brought into final stages before the public can legally challenge them. Alyeska Pipeline Company, which is responsible for the pipeline project in

Alaska, went ahead and bought all the steel for the entire pipeline and hired a full staff to begin construction of the road in Alaska before it had gotten governmental approval.

There is another thing. This is the Revolving Fund within the Highway Trust Fund which allows state governments to purchase land for highway right-of-way before any public hearings are held on the project and the money can be paid back over seven years.

Labor unions, citizens and students are beginning to fight back. Some of the labor unions that work with harmful chemicals and substances are urging environmental reforms.

In an unusual move last month the United Steel Workers of America in Birmingham, Alabama supported the imposition of stricter controls on the U. S. Steel plant, which was partially responsible for the emergency air pollution crisis.

Campaign GM is launching into its second year. This was started by a group of public interest lawyers in Washington, D.C. who wanted to make GM more responsive to the public and is now asking that GM reveal pollution statistics and information to the public. And they are receiving support from major banks and other people across the country.

One of the most impressive citizen battles against industrial strength is being waged by a husband and wife team, Mr. and Mrs. O. D. Hagedorn in Anmoore, West Virginia.

Angered by critically unchecked pollution from the Union Carbide plant in town, they have distributed to townspeople and Union Carbide officials over 87 issues of a one-sheet mimeo newsletter, "The Carbon Copy," with biting satirical cartoons about plant management. Their editorial policy is, "We'll try to be good little angels and keep our 'Carbon Copies' no more offensive than Union Carbide's pollution."

Contrary to the history book impression, as one battle is fought, another slips by. The Hagedorn's aren't the only ones who have had to sustain their fight for over a year.

While the coalition for the SST was fighting to stop funding last December, the Highway Trust Fund passed for another five years, and already, only five months later, appropriations for the SST are back in debate again. The House has passed an amendment authorizing $85 million for a continuing SST subsidy. The vote comes to the Senate at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday. The important thing is that the vote goes back to the House again and hopefully delegates from this region will stick to their votes against the SST.

In another instance Alyeska Pipeline was temporarily stopped from constructing the Alaska pipeline because of two injunctions against them. An environmental impact statement was written, but poorly, and it has to be be revised. Few people realize that at the same time native land claims were coming up and had to be settled before pipeline construction could begin, and if this could be left alone it would be very easy for oil companies to convince natives that they had to accept the Administration proposal for land immediately without a land use policy. It is crucial that a land use policy be planned for the entire state before the construction of a pipeline so that the land uses can be restricted and natural areas can be protected.

I think the fact that coalitions are being formed, the involvement of labor, the concentration on urban reforms, all are leading to events that are part of the general struggle for reform.

One estimate placed the 1971 defense budget at 73.6 billion dollars. At the same time another estimate put the combined pollution control and Federal water quality budget for 1971 at 7.4 million or roughly a little more than one percent of the defense budget. We are certainly hopeful that reform would allow for some constructive as well as destructive projects.

At the same time that environmentalists are fighting for constructive reform, one of the questions coming up is whether or not environmentalists are becoming more militant. We have been asked this question several times. I think the answer is that if militancy is defined by persistance and action, then the answer is yes. Groups are getting organized through cooperation with each other and being very persistent in battles.

We have got a contest underway to get citizens to submit tactics that can stop institutions and corporations from polluting the environment. Many people are saying this is asking for a military war including bombing.

I believe we have indicated we are looking for informative and imaginative tactics that won't harm life styles.

One of the best examples of harassment was when the Sierra Club in California decided to stop a ski resort which would have taken up a lot of wilderness land and natural wildlife sanctuaries. By staging an anti-litter hike and walking through the hills they picked up all the stakes for the highway. This is the type of tactic that is successful, and not necessarily militant insofar as they are persistent and they are sure that we want changes made.

I think there has been a transformation. There has not been widespread publicity of Earth Week this year. Now the emphasis is on action projects within the communities and on the contact between the grass roots and national level, and as long as public opinion will stay informed then it will have the strong influence that it is having at this time.

Thank you.

Does anybody have any questions about the book or anything?

(No response.)

MR. LAWLOR: Thank you, Miss Taylor.

And as we move on unbelievably ahead of schedule -- because that's what we are here for. I don't want to stand up here and have people preach today. That's not why we got together. One of the most important functions of meetings like this is for you to get to know each other. I was absolutely astounded to find out people are here from Louisville and from 20 miles away. It is one of the greatest things that could come out of this type of meeting. I hope when we go out to lunch you will get together and maybe start coordinating your programs.

I believe the next speaker on our agenda today is Mrs. Louise Rome of the League of Women Voters.

Mrs. Rome.

MRS. ROME: I have a question about this book. In your list of organizations, national organizations concerned with environmental problems you don't list the League of Women Voters. We have been working in this field since 1965 and I think you overlooked us.

I also have a question on a comment you made about worker relocation. It is not a question -- I have a comment to make on that very subject.

When we talk about the environment and what we can do about it, worker relocation is an important factor. If industry is to move into new locations, they have got to take the workers with them. While you work for a clean environment, we will add to the responsibility of that clean environment the right of all people to live in any situation, and we will continue our efforts for open occupancy and for the right of low and moderate income housing to be placed in the suburban new communities where it is essential for worker relocation. That is part of the problem and I think the sooner the environmental groups get on with the business of including civil rights and minority rights, the sooner we will have a cleaner environment. I was given a rather nebulous title, "How to Work within the System." It would be easy for me to stand here and list the agencies in Illinois with which I am more familiar and the Federal agencies which are involved in pollution abatement.

But let's first suggest your appropriation for action, at least as I and the League of Woman Voters see it. Working within the system does not imply a conclusion to perpetuate the status quo. It demands an analysis of the goals you wish to achieve and an affiliation with the organization working for your goals, which Russell Traines of the Council of Environmental Quality, speaking on this subject said, and this is a quote: "If you are a woman, join the League of Women Voters." He didn't say that, because we are supporters of the establishment -- we are and we are not, depending on where the establishment is going. He knows League members will arrive at a position after study and will oppose in the Halls of Congress any recommendation of the Administration which does not meet our goals.

He has heard our spokesman testify in Washington on more legislation in the past 15 years. We have always asked for more strict controls, more research, more citizen involvement in the decisionmaking process, than the Administration has proposed.

We have accepted the limitations of current legislation and challenged their effectiveness. We have asked that every single law be enforced as written. We have appeared before every enforcement conference under the Federal Pollution Control Act in this country.

I think Ralph Nader, when he analyzed the functions of the proceedings of the various, some 50 enforcement conferences through this country, found a statement of violation in every one of them. We have been there trying to make the system, with its built-in weaknesses, work effectively. We have opposed inadequate funding of municipal treatment plant grant programs for the past five years. In 1969 and 1970 we joined the Citizens' Crusade for Clean Water to grant more funds than were provided in the Administration budget -- which Frank knows -- we will lobby behind our committee. We cannot afford to stop at the committee level with a nice pat, prepared statement. We are not a tax-exempt organization and are free of hang-ups.

Many conservation groups -- it has always bothered me that conservation groups say, "But we can't testify in Springfield, we can't demonstrate in Congress. We can't do this, we can't do that, or we will lose our tax exempt status." When the conservation movement accepts the fact that you lose more by your tax exempt status, they will give it up and make funds more effective and their actions more dominant.

We in the League are now giving active consideration to the use of courts where administrative procedures fall short of our goals. The Sierra Club has done that since then, and in the doing lost its tax exempt status. I am sure they are happier without the hang-up of tax exemption.

In discussion the process of working within the system, it is logical to say you must first determine your goals and the amount of time and money you are able to invest to achieve it.

There are a few foxes, and Miss Taylor referred to The Fox of Aurora. He is a loner and he has made headlines. But the average citizen is not capable of running a single lone campaign, and incidentally, he's got help now. He has a staff. He's got little boys that run around and stake out the various facilities. He couldn't function alone and not be in jail by this time.

Most administrative decisions and legislative actions are based on the political process. They are responding to public demand and it seems to me when the conservation movement is willing to say, "We will get involved in the political process," they will be more successful in what they hope to achieve. New legislation at all levels makes room for public hearings.

At this time prepare to participate this summer. If you are a resident of Illinois new hearings throughout the State will be hald on water quality standards. There is legislation pending in Congress which says that water quality standards are not sufficient. We need revised effluent standards. The League has been testifying for this for years and here in Illinois our Illinois Pollution Control Board is not waiting for the United States Congress to act. They are considering the establishment of precise effluent standards.

If you are a resident of Illinois, you have the opportunity to prepare your testimony and to get cutting and be ready for those hearings.

If you are a resident of Illinois and not a subscriber to the Illinois Pollution Control Board Newsletter, get yourself on the mailing list "like yesterday." It's free and all these hearings will be listed. 189 West Madison Street, ask for the Illinois Pollution Control Board Newsletter. It's probably the can't testify in Springfield, we can't demonstrate in Congress. We can't do this, we can't do that, or we will lose our tax exempt status." When the conservation movement accepts the fact that you lose more by your tax exempt status, they will give it up and make funds more effective and their actions more dominant.

We in the League are now giving active consideration to the use of courts where administrative procedures fall short of our goals. The Sierra Club has done that since then, and in the doing lost its tax exempt status. I am sure they are happier without the hang-up of tax exemption.

In discussion the process of working within the system, it is logical to say you must first determine your goals and the amount of time and money you are able to invest to achieve it.

There are a few foxes, and Miss Taylor referred to The Fox of Aurora. He is a loner and he has made headlines. But the average citizen is not capable of running a single lone campaign, and incidentally, he's got help now. He has a staff. He's got little boys that run around and stake out the various facilities. He couldn't function alone and not be in jail by this time.

Most administrative decisions and legislative actions are based on the political process. They are responding to public demand and it seems to me when the conservation movement is willing to say, "We will get involved in the political process," they will be more successful in what they hope to achieve. New legislation at all levels makes room for public hearings.

At this time prepare to participate this summer. If you are a resident of Illinois new hearings throughout the State will be hald on water quality standards. There is legislation pending in Congress which says that water quality standards are not sufficient. We need revised effluent standards. The League has been testifying for this for years and here in Illinois our Illinois Pollution Control Board is not waiting for the United States Congress to act. They are considering the establishment of precise effluent standards.

If you are a resident of Illinois, you have the opportunity to prepare your testimony and to get cutting and be ready for those hearings.

If you are a resident of Illinois and not a subscriber to the Illinois Pollution Control Board Newsletter, get yourself on the mailing list "like yesterday." It's free and all these hearings will be listed. 189 West Madison Street, ask for the Illinois Pollution Control Board Newsletter. It's probably the most dynamic newsletter published by any state agency in this country.

Now, let's get down to a few specifics on local action. I think we are in agreement, Miss Taylor and I, that the real action is at the local level. Now let's take a specific. Are you concerned about the use of uncontrolled high sulphur coal at Commonwealth Edison's State Line Plant? That's very specific. If so, call the Clean Air Coordinating Committee or Tuberculosis Institution of Chicago and Cook County. Ask them what local groups are working in that area.

If you live in the area of the State Line Plant and are saturated with their pollutants, get involved in the local action group. Get involved in the legal battle now developing over the State Line Plant. The Clean Air Coordinating Committee can give you a list of all the organizations in that area. It can tell you what action is now being considered through the Chicago Department of Environmental Control. Mr. Wallace Poston is the Commissioner of that Department. It is his responsibility to implement the City law which says that all plants within two miles of the city limits of Chicago come under the jurisdiction of Chicago. The State Line plant is in Indiana, but it is less than a mile from the borders of the City of Chicago. It therefore comes under the jurisdiction of Chicago, and a legal battle is developing to force Commonwealth Edison to comply with the law.

If you live in that area, it is only one example of how to be involved in the local action which can solve some of our problems.

Now, suppose you live in another suburban community or in another county outside of Cook County which is covered by the Cook County Air Pollution Control Bureau and you have a similar problem in your area.

Air pollution -- let's stay with air pollution for the moment. Go to your city hall and ask that the ordinance is. It will not be surprising if you find that your municipality has no ordinance. That's the time to get started and write one. Citizens have written more ordinances and presented them to local boards and gotten them adopted than any one of us would be capable of understanding.

It's citizen pressure against the local political structure which has probably been responsible for the adoption of most local ordinances on air pollution.

So if you don't have one, write one.

Your next step, if you find that you are in difficulties with an air pollution problem which you can't control, either through the local or county agency, is to file a simple complaint with the Illinois Pollution Control Board. Just simply ask the Pollution Control Board for copies of their file forms -- they have special forms -- all you have got to do is fill in, write the names of the company or institution or facility, whatever it is, causing pollution in your neighborhood and send it in to the Board, which will ask the Environmental Protection Agency of Illinois to investigate. This is an interesting step in itself.

If they investigate and find pollution existing the EPA has the authority to act. You have to be willing to use the laws which are on the books.

Now, you say, "The EPA acted and nothing happened, and I'm not satisfied." The next step is to go out and get yourself a lawyer and file an official complaint on Section 32-B of the Environmental Protection Act of the State of Illinois. You must have a lawyer; there is no point in trying to file this would legal help. The Rules of Evidence apply and the complainant must present the evidence to prove his case. Otherwise, he will obviously lose.

Then don't expect to stop with the decision of the Pollution Control Board. You may win -- you may think you have won. But the law allows the person against whom you presented your case to file an appeal of the decision of the Illinois Pollution Control Board in the Appellate Court. So plan on large legal fees and stay with it through the Appellate Court. You may even wind up in the United States -- excuse me -- in the Illinois Supreme Court, which is the case expected in the Granite City Steel Case in Southern Illinois.

Now, let's look at water pollution. Is industry seemingly dumping pollutants in your favorite river or lake? If so, look for the environmental action group in your community. Numbers are important. Try to join in a group. If you don't know what groups exist in your area, ask the Open Lands Project. Ask the League of Women Voters. Ask the Chicago Tribune, which maintains a very long list of conservation groups in Cook County. Go first to the Cook County Clean Streams Committee meetings.

Now, you can notify them of your complaint and they will take some action. But the reason I recommend the Cook County Clean Streams Committee meeting is that it is a semi-official organization and at their meetings you can meet the representatives of every official body functioning in this area.

It's important to know who the people are and what the agencies are. Now, all of these agencies take the trouble to send a representative to the meetings of the Cook County Clean Streams Committee, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago; the Cook County Health Department; the Army Corps of Engineers is there; The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is there; the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency is there; The Division of Waterways; The Northern Illinois Plan Commission -- they are all there at the Cook County Clean Streams Committee meetings, and it's a good way to get started, to investigate the official agencies in the area.

The Army Corps, as you know, administers the 1899 Refuse Act, which is now coming out of hiding, and which Mr. Polikoff will talk about later. It's a key area in water pollution and you will learn more about it later.

Is your municipality one of the 64 -- and I emphasize 64 -- now dumping improperly treated sewage into Lake Michigan. That's a late, up-to-date figure given at a four-state enforcement conference.

Don't wait for the enforcement conference to solve your problem. That's one of the hang-ups the League has with enforcement. It's slow, it's cumbersome, -- I know only one instance in all these 50 enforcement conferences where the law has been against the municipality.

Ask yourself what you are doing to help resolve the problem. Have you met with the officials in your community in an attempt to understand the problem? Start by getting the representative groups of citizens and take that group of citizens to an official appointment with your local agency.

Citizen groups are more effective than the individual. When you go to that agency, go prepared with the proper questions. Do you know the costs of bringing your community facilities up to the needs of your population? Learn all the facts. It's not only your citizen population which counts. You must also find out the population equivalent in industrial waste.

It is one thing to build sewage treatment plants for a population such as we have here in this metropolitan area of roughly five million people, but that five million sewage system is not adequate when you consider that the Metropolitan Sanitary District also handles an equivalent industrial waste of about three to three and a half million.

So that our facility in a population of five or five and a half million has to be adequate to treat the waste of a population equivalent of eight and a half to nine million. Now, when you have found all the details of community needs and community costs, don't overlook, when you are asking the question about the control of combined sewage and control of storm water outflows, don't walk away from the conference thinking you have accomplished something. You have only begun.

At that point you must appoint an observer from your organization to attend every single board meeting and find out what's going on. Don't authorize your observer to get in an argument. It's preferable for your observer to sit there and take copious notes and go back to your organization with the details. Then you take official organization action and come back to the next board meeting. Never let your observer get involved in an argument which may not represent the position of your organization.

Get access to all public records. Remember they are yours under the Public Information Act. The only thing you have to do, and I say this with a great deal of emphasis, is be polite and unobstrusive. Remember that the people who work in official agencies have jobs to do and it's not your function to go in and upset office routines.

Discuss with your officials the alternatives. Attend and speak at the public hearings which you have a right to demand in all questions of sewage and industrial pollution. Be part of the planning process.

Now, let's assume you have come up with the plan that meets all your criteria. You can't stop and say, "Okay, we have a plan, we have agreed this is what is needed." You have got to pay for it. You have got to be able to work on the bond issues with knowledge and facts. The bond issue is a political proposition and consequently, your entire community will not agree with you. You must win the majority of the vote, knowing that all don't share your priorities.

There are many who will place housing, jobs, eduction, transportation and other needs high above the need to clean up effluents from your municipal sewage treatment plants. Bond issues are hard to pass.

Let's assume yours fails. Then you must consider, do we wish to wait for another effort or do we wish to go for legal action. Legal action may have come before you have an opportunity to make that decision. In Illinois the Environmental Protection Agency may catch up with your community, find it in violation and issue an order prohibiting all extensions of sewage systems until your municipality comes up with the necessary treatment facility.

Now, let's go to the City of Mattoon, Illinois, where we in the League have had some experience. The EPA came up and said, "You fellows have been messing up the creek and we want it stopped right now. There sat the Kraft Foods Company with a factory all ready to open.

When the ban was put through, the city, which had voted Kraft to come in, wanting the new industry, appealed to the Illinois Pollution Control Board for a variance to go ahead and tie Kraft in.

The case was held and the request for a variance was placed before a hearing officer in a hearing set up in the City Council by the Illinois Pollution Control Board.

The League of Women Voters, armed with the legal facts, armed with the sorry story of delay with which it had been confronted, the years of inaction on the part of the city officials, called up the Federal EPA and said, "Will you send us someone to assure our state officials that you in the Federal Government will back us?"

With a little reluctance the Federal EPA said, "Yes, these are Federal water standards and we will back up the State of Illinois." The Illinois Pollution Control Board has refused to lift the ban in Mattoon. The League was involved. We were glad we were there. If we were not there, some other organization should have been because we were the only organization supporting the sewer ban and the need for cleanup in that city.

Now, let's get off on one other subject which bothers me terribly. Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan in the Lake Michigan basin provide state aid for municipal treatment plants, and remember, there are 64 in violation in the Lake Michigan basin alone -- and there are probably many more in inland waters in the states that are also in violation -- but there are 64, and let's stay with the Lake Michigan problem right now.

Now, if there is anyone here from Indiana, the last I heard your state refused to participate. One year you participated and then your legislature said no more money. In Illinois we are now set and ready to spend the $750 million bond issue over the next eight to ten years, roughly, to help municipalities.

We have planned it will give to municipalities 25 percent of the cost of treatment plants. The same law applies in Wisconsin and Michigan. When we passed that bond issue last fall, I was part of the coalition that went out speaking and urging citizens to vote "yes" because the Federal Government will give you 50 percent for your operation if we give you 25. Otherwise they will only give 30 and you will have to pay the remaining 70 percent. I suppose one can't say we lied to the people of the State of Illinois. We had the assurance of Congress in the passage of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1965 that Congress intended for the Federal Government to aid the municipalities.

We also knew that on July 1, which is six weeks from now, we would see the end of that Federal program unless Congress acted. We probably should have said to the citizens of Illinois, "Go out and vote 'yes' on the bond issue, but start the ground root swell right now. Work with the 24 Congressmen and 2 Senators to get the United States Congress to do something about fulfilling its promise about sewage treatment grants." As I said, the money expires July 1.

Now, what has Congress done in the past about the question of Federal financing? If you will excuse me a minute, I want to show you something.

This is a letter, a Conservation Foundation letter, a report on the Federal Assistance program. The 1965 Clean Water Restoration Act set up a schedule of authorizations for each of the succeeding years. Money authorizations, I think, started out at 350 million the first year, moved up so that in 1969 the Congress should have appropriated 700 millions. In 1970 it should have appropriated a billion, and in 1971, which is the current year, Congress should have appropriated $1,250,000,000. It hasn't done this. Not only is there a gap between the promise and Congressional authorizations, there is a further gap between the appropriations of Congress and the amount of money the Federal Government has spent. In each administration the amount of money requested has been less than the amount authorized.

Let's take 1970 as a "for instance." The authorized amount in the Clean Water Restoration Act was a billion, and the President requested $214 million. In his budget message he said, "We are in a war and we cannot afford this much money for sewage treatment grants."

We have been through this two previous years and been left on the short end of the stick, the Federal stick, the Federal promise. So all of the national conservation groups with some leadership for Congress organized the Citizens' Crusade for Clean Water and instituted a nationwide campaign to get that billion dollars appropriated.

The Congress appropriated $800 instead of the billion actually obligated by this agency.

Again, the question is, how much to appropriate. The President requested a very small amount of money in this budget. I have forgotten the amount, something like $60 million. He had a new program -- he wished to drop out the whole '71 authorization and start anew on a four-year program of one billion dollars a year for each of four years, less than has been appropriated in the Clean Water Restoration Act.

The President's program got nowhere and the citizens, Citizens' Crusade for Clean Water organized and we got an appropriation of one billion dollars, $250 million less than the amount in the authorization.

Now, the question arises, how is the one billion dollars being spent? To begin with, Congress earmarked $200 million of that money and said that money should be spent to repay states which prefinanced in previous years on the promise of Federal money.

But the $200 million was to be used either to repay some of the states or in critical areas like Lake Erie, a "for instance," or Upper New York Harbor, a "for instance." That money could have been spent in either place, which are certainly critical areas.

Instead, the money has been tied up by the Office of Management and Budget and none of it is being spent. If you want to take effective citizen action, start looking at the money that Congress has appropriated and which the Office of Management and Budget has permitted to be spent. In the water field alone it's $200. In the housing and urban development area it is $192 million to the Model Cities Program. This is only a small part of it.

I read in the Sunday paper that two billion in domestic programs, money which has been appropriated by Congress, is being held by the Office of Management and the Budget. We are being deluded into thinking that appropriation means solution to problems.

We have no citizen lobby to analyze and follow what the Government is doing with its programs and it's time we woke up to the reality. Now the money is expiring, the whole program expires July 1.

Maybe they will release $200 million and allow that to be spent after July 1, I don't know.

The President, in a very, very lengthy volume which I shall show you -- and I think you can go buy one across the street at the Federal Building -- this is the President's program written by Russell Train -- Mr. Ruckelshaus in the Environmental Protection Agency. It is all the bills, the water and air pollution and ocean management introduced in this administration. As I say, it's available across the street for $2.25, if you wish to buy it.

The amendment to Section 8 of the Water Pollution Control Act says that the administration will go for $12 billion for a three-year program with municipal treatment plants. It's actually $2 billion a year in Federal money for each of the three years to match $2 billion in local money for each of the three years, and I will show you another little gem.

The Cost of Clean Water dated March 17, 1971, from the Environmental Protection Agency lists state by state the needs and comes up with needs of $2 billion over the next three years. Write your Congressman for this. Incidentally, always write your Congressman for any information. And to get it faster, go through the Superintendent of Documents.

The point about the President's program, which is substantiated with the list of state needs -- Section 8 as amended here says that 25 percent of $2 billion must be used to repay states. Take 25 percent of $2 billion and you are left with this financing.

Take a billion and a half and double it each year, assuming that the states and municipalities provide 50 percent, and you come up with a three billion dollar program.

Now, there are other proposals before the

Congress here. S523, this is Senator Muskie's proposal -- write to Senator Muskie and you will get it by return mail, no money. It is his proposal to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. He proposes two and a half billion per year for each of five years, which is a step higher and probably more realistic to the needs.

Congressman Dingell has proposed five billion dollars a year for each of five years. Congressman Dingell has raised the amount of the Federal grant to the municipalities from 50 to 89.

Maybe Dingell's five billion dollars a year for each of five years supplies the final solution. I don't know what it is. It is up to Congress. But I do know one thing: If as effective citizens you are not lobbying and you are not writing your letters to Congress, your heads are in the sand and you have got to get them out. The program will not go ahead without citizen action and greater citizen understanding of what the real issues are. We cannot sit back and say, "Congress has appropriated; therefore, everything is fine." You have got to be willing to watch during the process once it goes to the Office of Management and the Budget.

You have got to be willing to work in your local municipality to see to it your needs are met locally and that your citizens are apprised of the actual situation.

I think I have said more than my share.

A VOICE: You quoted a figure of $12 billion being appropriated for all types of projects by the Federal Government. Can you tell me how much has been released and by whom?

MRS. ROME: Nothing has been released. The program is only proposed. It hasn't been heard in Congress. Senator Muskie has had hearings, but the House has done nothing on those bills as yet. And as I say, July 1 is six weeks away. I spoke to Senator Percy last week and I asked him if he thought Congress would act on it in a reasonable time. He said there is no real push on the Hill to get any of this legislation before committees or before Congress as a whole.

The only way we are going to get it through is if citizens push. The program expires July 1, and if you want it to extend, you have got to do something to push Congress to do something about it.

I have a little outline on this very problem which I wrote for the State of Illinois -- Financing Municipal Treatment Plants in the State of Illinois. It does explain the gap in authorization and appropriation.

It doesn't explain the gap in actual spending. The problem is in the Office of Management and the Budget. We would have to depend on the Small Conservation Foundation to provide these facts. We are not alert and we better decide that being alert is half of the battle, if not all of it.

A VOICE: It was my understanding last fall that the $750 million bond issue would pretty much clean up problems in Illinois. Since that time I have heard other comments to the effect this would provide less than one-fourth the actual funds needed to do the job.

Do you have any recent figures on that?

MRS. ROME: When the bond issue was proposed it was based on existing Federal legislation. The Federal legislation at that time said, "We will give 30 percent to a municipality in the cost of building its municipal facility."

Then it has another little subparagraph that says, however, if the state provides 25 percent to the municipality we will raise our sights and give the municipality 50 percent. There are some other little benefits on regional planning and so forth. When we went out to sell the bond issue we said, "Look, if we give 25 percent to the municipality, the Federal share will jump to 50 or 55 percent, depending on planning, and our local municipalities will only have to pay 20 or 25 percent." That was based on existing Federal legislation. The difficulty is that the money appropriation is not there. That $750 million was a ten-year program designed to meet ten years' needs of the state.

So it was roughly over $2 billion. In fact, $650 was intended for municipal grants for sewage and $100 million was roughly intended for solid waste management. So you have $650 million for water alone.

A VOICE: Are you aware there is not Federal legislation prohibiting dumping on the Federal boats in the Great Lakes area? Are you aware of that?

MRS. ROME: From Federal boats? From international boats of any kind.

Well, there is under the regulations -- the legislation passed by Congress last year. The EPA was required to set up boat dumping regulations, and there is a time gap in which those boat regulations become effective. I think it's five years for existing boats and two years for new construction.

Now, there has been a very serious conflict with it. I think that the Lake Michigan states have no control over international shipping. They have had control over boats which are owned in the area.

Under the legislation which passed last year, Congress gave the Federal Government preference over state law, and under the new regulations which have just come out -- and I said they are not applicable for two years on new boats and five years on old boats -- will require secondary treatment, and I believe it will cover international as well.

It will be the law that all boats must have the equivalent of secondary sewage facilities aboard, but that it can dump effluents for those facilities into any navigable water.

When Mr. Ruckelshaus was here last week, people asked him various questions. Mr. Ruckelshaus replied that if the governors of the four states wish to request special rulings for their states, it will be given consideration. Not only the governors of the four states ought to be requesting it. If we want to protect Lake Michigan, we have to ask for higher standards.

MR. LAWLOR: Thank you very much, Mrs. Rome. I think that you all can learn from her group the importance of research and special organizations.

Right now, what I'd like to propose is a small break of around 20 or 25 minutes. You can stretch your legs and meet each other.

Do whatever you want, and be back in about 20 minutes.

(Recess taken.)

MR. CORRADO: Our next speaker is a former reporter for the Minneapolis Tribune, an environmental reporter. He is on the staff of Senator Gaylord Nelson, his legislative assistant, and a good friend of mine, and he knows the environmental movement from a number of angles.

We are very pleased to have with us this morning Mr. Ron Way.

MR. WAY: Thank you, Frank.

Just a few comments and disclaimers before I get started.

The program lists me as administrative assistant to Senator Nelson. I'm a legislative assistant on the Senator's Washington staff. The differences in the two positions are many, but irrelevant. This is no big deal, but this is the second time in a single week that I've been referred to as the administrative assistant, and I suppose if it keeps up, the incumbent may show signs of paranoia.

I suppose my position with the Senator may have been an entre as a participant at this seminar. I'm more than happy to give you the benefit of my wisdom, for whatever it may be worth. All I ask is that you keep in mind that I am talking as me -- don't blame Senator Nelson for any of it -- unless, of course, I say something that is highly popular. In that case, I won't have to give him credit, he'll just take it.

So much for disclaimers.

The program says that we'll be talking about working within the system. That's sort of nondescript. Because with very few exceptions, every organization today is working within the system, including the May Day demonstrators in Washington recently, even though their methods may have seemed a bit unorthodox. To begin with, when they attempted to close down the government, we responded by mobilizing the troops, which was really kind of silly, according to one commentator, who pointed out that governmental efficiency improves in direct proportion to the rate of absenteeism.

As for me, I was late getting to work that morning. I was caught in a traffic jam on Highway 295 in South Washington caused by a troop convoy that was moving through to quash the demonstration. They had cars backed up for three miles.

But what the demonstrators on this occasion and so many other occasions were trying to is display the depth of their concern to the established order. As I said, their methods of operation rankled a good many people in the Congress, and we heard a number of speeches in both the House and the Senate condemning their actions.

Union Carbide and U. S. Steel, among others, demonstrate their concern in other ways, like issuing a news release to threaten a layoff of employees if the company is forced to install pollution control equipment. What I ask is, who are the real criminals in this society?

Time after time we have seen delays within the established order: The flag-wavers from industry and from city halls who appeal to Congress they are not being given enough time to install the equipment that is already being manufactured. We have the technological capabilities of cleaning up the air and the water. We have known this for a good, long time. But then when some demonstrators come to Washington, we call out the troops. Overall, what we're really talking about today is how to make the system work, how to make the system more responsive to you and to the society it is supposed to lead and to serve.

I would suggest that you don't look at the system all at once, because it is really an imposing beast. I don't know how many times I have heard people ask, "Where is the leadership in this country?" I guess it was last seen lurking around the framers of the Constitution, and it didn't seem to make a very good impression, because we were left with a document that parceled out the leadership in a manner to keep anyone from having very much, which was good then and certainly in accord with the temper of the time.

But today we have developed such a large and massively complex society with myriad critical problems. Government became complex and large right along with the advancing technology. Political parties have been unresponsive to the needs of society. They compounded the problem by parceling out the leadership in a more diffused fashion than even the framers of the Constitution had envisioned, and I guess in my few short months in Washington I have been impressed by one thing: We have a hell of a hard time finding a handful to grasp in getting legislation through.

There are so many intangibles we have to deal with, it is really a burden on the whole legislative process. I work in the Senate, and we only have 100 members to deal with. I can about imagine what the problems are like in the House with considerably more people.

The effect of advancing technology has been that a lot of people have dropped out over the years as active participants in the system, and unfortunately, they have left the task of watchdog to the lobbyists with assignments from special interest groups. We all know that lobbyists have been very successful over the years. All we have to do is look at the mess we are in today. This mess is due at least party to the efforts of the special interest groups.

Congress has failed by default. Oftentimes people consider the Congress as a cure-all in trying to solve the concerns of the day. This is wrong, because the Congress, unfortunately, the Federal system as we have established it in this country is not, I believe, truly responsive not only to the needs, but also not able to step back from the concerns and provide some leadership.

The powerful interests spend millions of dollars every year in getting their message to the government. They have full-time staffs in Washington and well-heeled representatives who make contact with the Congress and with the Administration.

One of the first tasks of any environmental group is trying to get to the Congress and this can be an imposing chore in many, many ways. Certainly, the environmental groups don't have the funds to staff a

Washington organization that can keep pace with the pace set by the lobbyists.

But there are a few more things working for the environmentalists that I will cover later. One of the main points is that while I believe that the environmental protection and enhancement is one of the greatest issues facing the country, it seems that a few of the Congressmen and Senators are beginning to agree. At least we hear a lot of speeches and a lot of fine talk, not only in the House and Senate, but throughout the country.

But I would caution you not to be fooled by the rhetoric. Congress does not agree that the environment is deserving of special priority. I think this can be documented time and time again, and I won't bother with that today. I wanted to call your attention, however, to the fact that speeches that have been given by the Congress have really covered the periphery of the issues. They don't deal with the substance. When the substance does come along, it becomes a great issue and oftentimes it is defeated by default or because of, I am supposing, an economic argument that is waged by those interests who stand to lose at least economically over a short term, or so they tell us.

We have already heard numerous arguments why the environment should be improved. We heard it on Earth Day last year; we heard it during Earth Week this year. Last June here in Chicago in this hotel we heard it from a group called the Congress on Population in the Environment. I attended that session for a week. It was carried out in plush, air conditioned comfort here in this hotel while outside the ghettos were teaming.

I recall going to a restaurant down on the lake front and watching the smog roll in. Nothing was really being accomplished at that meeting. And I think that even if we give SCOPE credit for attempting to start, we have not seen much initiative from that organization. They will go to sponsor seminars, symposiums, Earth Days and various programs where they parade lecturers before the podium. When it comes right down to it, we don't get much feedback in the Congress.

Now, some have suggested that the issue is petering out, the environmental issue. That, I don't really thing. I think that most certainly there is a solid grass roots organization that has been formed or many organizations that have been formed, and at least people are thinking in the right direction. I don't think that the real thing has gone very far up the ladder.

What we have to do then is provide some

substance to the arguments already laid out before us and I think this can be accomplished by exploiting the increasing concern man is displaying for the condition of his environment and by recognizing some realities of the system we have established.

My first suggestion: Don't waste your time by expounding all the reasons why the environment must be improved. People may be getting tired of the rhetoric, much of which they can't relate to. In plain truth Americans are much more concerned about today's paycheck and the weekend weather than they are about the fate of the peregrine falcon, the bald eagle, Lake Michigan, or even the fate of man himself.

It boils down to this: A rational argument isn't always the best argument, that is in the Congress. Take the pro-SST advertising that we heard on the radio prior to the last vote in the Congress. That advertising, consisting of short messages heard frequently throughout the day, called on the Congress to have faith in American technology period. Or the oil company that shows hordes of people walking while the announcer says that some people think the way to solve the air pollution problem is by getting rid of the automobile. The can and bottle manufacturers emphasize that litter is the problem, not recycling.

The utility companies are appealing to the American public to allow them to build their power facilities so they can meet the rising demand for energy. They say it doubles every eight to ten years. They ignore the fact that the population is going to double in the next 60, and they don't reconcile the difference in these two figures.

What I am saying is this: The polluters are not appealing to Congress with rational arguments. They have recognized that there are more appealing ways to get to the Congress.

Most often, the argument is on the economic issue. When you talk about threatened jobs, whether it be Union Carbide or U. S. Steel or any other plant throughout the country, this is something that affects a good many people very directly and it has its impact. They are not going to be bothered with arguments that if the Congress would appropriate the money or spend the money to perhaps improve a municipal treatment system, to improve the mass transit system in this country, that would provide the jobs for these people and retraining is possible. But rather they push ahead on something like the SST with the argument that jobs will be created.

So may I suggest that when you do have a concern, when you do have an issue, that you have tried to research and study the economics of that issue with sufficient information to allow the people you are trying to reach to identify with that issue, because Americans are hung up on the dollar, and I can hardly think of an important issue before the Congress in the last several years in which economics didn't play an important role.

The fact that the environmental groups have not done a good job of dealing with the economics of a healthy environment is borne out by the backlash. You recall the speech by Thomas R. Shepard, Jr., the publisher of Look magazine, in which he referred to the Disaster Lobby. That speech is being circulated widely by the industrial lobby in this country and they have attached their own arguments and their own comments suggesting that the environmentalists want to stop everything, that they don't care about jobs.

But in truth, as Dr. Barry Commoner has said, "The stability of the ecosystem is an essential prerequisite for the success of any economic system." More bluntly, Dr. Commoner says, "Any economic system which hopes to survive must be compatible with the continued operation of the ecosystem."

I am convinced that a splendid economic

argument can be made for the resurrection of a healthy ecosystem in practically every case. Study it, and be prepared with it. Most importantly, reduce it to terms that the layman can understand.

And here I am going to insert a commercial for a bill that has been introduced in this session by the Senator. And I want to use this to emphasize that any contention about the economics of environment is a very useful weapon and a necessary one.

Over the years Senator Nelson has introduced legislation to ban DDT, and this year he extended that by calling for a ban of eight chlorinated hydrocarbons. These bills have served to dramatize the issue.

But what we found out was that these bills were going nowhere. They didn't cause a ripple. Most certainly they didn't win the agricultural industry.

But earlier this year Senator Nelson introduced a bill that would provide for stringent controls on the use of pesticides, and we went ahead with this one. We got some hearings on the Senate side, but we recognized right away what we were up against, mostly on the House side where Congressman Poague and others were continually defending the use of chemicals in controlling pests.

On the Senate side we lined up some witnesses who discussed alternatives to pesticides and they had a dramatic impact. Our attention was called to the fact that in this country and elsewhere where chemicals over the years have enabled the pests, the target organisms through genetic diversity to develop resistance to these chemicals and there have been some startling examples of what has happened. In Northeastern Mexico, for example, farmers have been literally driven out of business in numbers over the tobacco budworm. This is an insect that cannot be controlled by pesticides any longer.

In the high plains area of Texas a grain bug infestation has caused the farmers to spend an increasing amount on pesticides, and figures were in 1967 they spent $100,000 to control the grain bug. Last year they spent an incredible amount of $100 million to control that same infestation.

All indications are that this year it's going to get higher and this hurts the farmers. And they have been conducting meeting after meeting in their own areas appealing to Congress for alternatives to pesticides as means of controlling pests.

About ten days ago Senator Nelson introduced a bill to continue this project with a system of biological control of insects.

When we took this message to the Congress we were surprised at the results. The first person to co-sponsor the legislation was Senator James Allen. He is Chairman of the subcommittee that will hear the legislation. He had heard over the years that the farmer is indeed in trouble because of the resistance factor built up in insects.

Senator Childs of Florida and Senator Gurney are going to co-sponsor this legislation. The Senator from Texas is going to come on very shortly. We have discussed this legislation with, of all people, the National Cotton Council and they are highly enthusiastic about the bill. We have discussed the legislation with the Great Plains Agricultural Council in New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma. These are people who have been opposing pesticide legislation for a number of years, and they will have endorsed the Senator's bill.

In the statement that the Senator introduced in the record last week -- and I have copies with me if you might want to look at it -- but in the statement we stressed the economics of the argument and found we had widespread acceptance by doing this. In fact, we think the legislation is going to pass. If it does, we are going to begin to reduce substantially, some say by at least 80 percent, the use of pesticides in this

This is phenomenal. This is something we couldn't have imagined doing a year ago. My point here is that when we stress the economics of environmental issues we are bound to wind up with much more support and most certainly we can have an argument to come back to the likes of Thomas Shepard in his criticism of the Disaster Lobby, as he calls it.

Of course, we have to be concerned about what the Office of Management and the Budget is supposed to do with funds appropriated by Congress. In the last session Senator Nelson -- in addition to him other Congressmen and Senators were able to win Congressional approval of the appropriation of $1 million to research non-chemical pest control. We thought that the bill had cleared and the money was going to be spent. Earlier this year we found that the administration had impounded this money and it wouldn't be spent. That just adds to the problem.

When I was working as a news reporter, I was often asked for recommendations on how to get the attention of Congress. In almost every case I told the inquirees to "write a letter to your Congressman."

By the way, how many have written at least once to their Congressman?

(Show of hands.)

Twice or more?

(Show of hands.)

How many have followed up by personal visit to Congressmen or Senators?

(Show of hands.)

I think this is really the key, personal contact with the Senators, and I will tell you why.

I discovered upon my arriving in Washington that my advise to "write your Congressman" was bad advice, because I have to share in the responsibility with other staff members in answering the letters sent to Senator Nelson.

The volume is great. We don't have very much time to devote to answering mail. I don't know how many pieces we get in every day's mail call, but take it from me -- the amount is substantial.

So we are trying to answer these letters as efficiently as we can. This means we write very short responses. To be perfectly frank, we haven't got the time to investigate every comment and respond to every request. This is not unusual. I talked with a member of the Congressional committee staff just the other day. He says all the mail to their office is answered by secretaries. It is not even brought to the attention of a Senator or professional staff of a committee.

This is not to suggest that you shouldn't write letters. But don't expect much in the form of results from a single letter to Congress. I might suggest this approach. Research the question, and know what the issues are. There are a number of groups that can help. The Scientists' Institute for Public Information; The Businessmen for the Public Interest; the League of Women Voters; and some excellent university people. I think there are many conservation organizations here in this area. Some, like the Sierra Club and Environmental Action even have a staff in Washington that can be of great help.

I must emphasize here it's extremely important you know what the issues are. There is nothing worse than to receive a question in the mail such as, "What is the Federal Government doing to clean up the water?" What do you do with something like that? Most of them end up in the waste can, or they are referred over to the EPA or the Interior Department for a form letter.

Once you have a firm grasp of the subject matter I would suggest you contact the Senators and Congressmen, in addition to your own, who have a special interest in your particular area of concern.

Spend a few cents and call the office and ask who on the legislative staff handles the issue that you are concerned about. Send the letter to his or her attention. Keep the letter brief and to the point.

Then, if you really want action, follow that up with a personal visit, announced well enough in advance to give the staff member an opportunity to be prepared. If you don't want to spend the money to go to Washington, Congressmen oftentimes come to their district to speak to the voters. Arrange a meeting at that time. Sit down with the Senator or Congressman for an hour or so, whatever the case may be, and discuss your problem with him.

If you do get to Washington, I would suggest that you not only organize a meeting with a single staff member, but get several staff members from several offices together and have a delegate of your own there to discuss this problem with them. Also ask to see the Senator or Congressman. If you are fortunate enough to get in to see the Senator you have to keep in mind that his time is very valuable. Keep the visit brief and tell him you will talk to the staff later. When you do get to see the staff, remind them you have talked with the Senator or Congressman.

If your concern is over a bill that has

already been introduced, find out which committee it has been assigned to. This can be done by asking for a copy of the legislation. On there is printed the committee to which the bill has been referred. Then make your contact with the committee in the same way, by calling the committee and asking who specifically will be handling this issue. I would suggest that you not necessarily speak with him over the telephone, but when you do write, send the letter to his attention and then again follow up with personal contact.

A committee member told me the other day that a letter means absolutely nothing and personal contact has a substantially greater impact on the committee you are dealing with.

Through all of this I am assuming that you have an issue or area of concern that fits in with the national legislative process. We get a number of letters that complain about a discharger who isn't conforming with state standards. If it's true, your request must be made to the state. There is not a thing that is going to be accomplished of substance by writing to the Senate or Congress. At that point if you have a problem, go to the local authorities, whether it be a City Council or some organization within the city hall or county government, because if you take a local or state problem to your Senator or Congressman you are wasting a lot of time, including your own by making the appeal to the wrong place.

Then, of course, you have to remember that publicity always helps. If you have a story a good reporter will write it and a good newspaper will publish it. The problem is there aren't too many of each in this country. I am speaking from experience. I do know, however, that some of the reporters here in Chicago and Milwaukee are generally good and they will be responsive if you have a good story.

Of course, whenever you do get a favorable story published in the newspaper, clip it out and sent it to the staff member you are dealing with. This, of course, is no guarantee of success. Even if you do prevail upon the Congressional system to get a bill introduced and get hearings before a committee, the chances are that Congress may not pass it, if it may get up for a vote.

A gal in the office the other day looked over the record of the last Congress. She counted 30,000 pieces of legislation that were introduced, and only 665 became public law. And when you subtract all the routine bills from the 665 you really haven't much left.

In our case, we got one million dollars for non-chemical pest control and felt victorious and then the Office of Management and the Budget impounded the money. Earlier I stressed the importance of the economic argument when dealing with environmental issues. That is what the Congressmen understand then they are in office. But what they also understand is votes, and given the political attractiveness of the environmental issue these days, you can make an unresponsive Congressman responsive if you demonstrate some political power.

In Minnesota, where I come from, there is a group that became very active politically simply by raising a lot of hell and they had some people who were good at this. It was Minnesota Environmental Control Citizens Association -- MECCA. The name in itself was attractive and generated a number of stories just from it. The organization was primarily responsible for making the environment a major issue in the state. Most of those in MECCA are Democrats, and they elected a governor of that party. And the governor appointed a member of MECCA to the state Pollution Control Agency. Now the problem is the "outs" are the "ins" and they seem to be suffering during the transition. Indeed, when the governor's appointee to the Agriculture Department recently called the state's proposed farm feedlot control standards asinine, MECCA never uttered a word.

There are some great environmental issues yet in Minnesota and MECCA is not carrying the word. So the caution here would be if you do organize politically, stick with it, no matter who is in. The environmental issues has been and continues to be potent politically, so exploit it for all it's worth.

Furthermore, the young people have seized upon the environment as one issue they concede to be one issue of priority. In past years the young people didn't count that much because they couldn't vote. But because politics is not an institution that readily lends itself to rationalism, and because they couldn't deliver at the polls, the youth were being alienated. Today, you have the vote. A recent union drive in Wisconsin and one other state showed that a surprisingly high number of young people are registering to vote. The youth can make a vital contribution to the environmental effort. They have the capacity and know-how on research and the energy to canvass for voters. I would encourage young people in this room and I would encourage those who don't consider themselves young people to talk together. It has been demonstrated time and time again that you can become a very potent political force by doing nothing more than raising all kinds of hell on a number of specific local issues.

When there is a campaign underway, invite the Congressman, invite the candidates for these offices to sit down with you at a public meeting and discuss public issues. If you disagree with him, tell him so, perhaps through the Letters to the Editors, perhaps by some other means.

Now, this is all working within the system and working on the system, and as I said before, don't hold out all that much hope because I think you can make substantial errors if you assume Congress and the state legislatures are going to solve all your problems. Don't be afraid to use the courts if the Federal Government is not responsive. There may be an avenue through the legal process. Certainly in the past years the administrative agencies have been guilty of gross neglect by not enforcing laws that are already on the books.

We can refer to the dramatic example of the Refuse Act that has been on the books for a number of years, since 1899. We can also look to the environmental impact statement that is required of Federal agencies to be filed when various programs will possibly have an effect on the environment. This is 3102C, I believe, of the National Environmental Policy Act.

The problem with the Act is that you can satisfy it by merely writing some words down on paper. These words will be submitted to the Council on Environmental Quality, which as I understand it, has a very, very small staff and certainly can't review all of the requests before it.

The other day there was an environmental impact statement filed by a utility in Wisconsin regarding a reservoir they had operated for the past 50 years. They wanted another license to operate it for another 50 years. The environmental impact statement consisted of two pages double-spaced. On those two pages they repeated the request. They had a total of one page that was responding to the questions as set forth in Parts 1 and 2 of the Environmental Policy Act.

But really when we get into the legal process I am intruding on the area of Mr. Polikoff, a man who had a great impact on the Congress by utilizing the courts and legal process in bringing the environmental issues to the floor.

I guess I have taken you through a cumbersome maze here this morning and it's only because the maze is cumbersome. And I guess what I wanted to do is emphasize what you are up against. It's a tedious task and you have to stick with it. These are easy things to say, but it is vital because there are lobbyists each and every day. There are special interests that are being protected. If you are going to allow the special interests to be the most influential in Congress, I guess you can do that easily by staying at home. I think that most of you here this morning are most concerned, and hopefully you will give us the benefit of your thoughts on these issues.

I will be glad to answer some questions if you have them.

A VOICE: What, if anything, can Congress do to uncork the funds that have been impounded by the Office of Management and the Budget. Your one million is a drop in the bucket.

MR. WAY: I know the one million is nothing more than a drop in the bucket when you consider the freeze on some other areas. I guess when you starting taking on the administration in this way, you are speaking to an agency -- the Office of Management and Budget -- that is so sheltered from the people in this country that it's very, very hard to get to it. All we can do is appeal through the Appropriations Committee on our issue. If we appeal to other offices to make a similar appeal to the Appropriations Committee and one of the various representatives of the administration came before that committee to comment on these programs for cleaning up the environment, maybe these requests will be considered. Unfortunately, we have, I'm afraid, some people who aren't very sensitive. They have shown some response in the area of non-chemical pest control cases, and we are hopeful that at least some of this money is going to be restored. I really don't know what the state is of the remainder of the funds.

I guess the question is really this: Are we going to allow the administration, the Office of Management and the Budget, to impose its own will in this area against the will of the Congress? There was a good deal of effort that went into appropriating this money for expenditures in areas that everybody knew was going to do an awful lot of good. At least it was a major start, and a continuation in some cases of efforts that have been waged for a number of years. We tried to make the appeal that the Congress has appropriated this money and that the Office of Management and Budget is really being unresponsive by impounding this money. I am sorry to say that is about all we can do.

A VOICE: What is the status of the bill that you referred to earlier?

MR. WAY: On pesticides?

MR. WAY: The bill to control the use of pesticides in the country, there has been a bill introduced, and I believe the number is S745 in the Senate and I forget what the number is in the House. In addition to this we have S660, which is Senator Nelson's bill, and a few other bills. All were before the House and Senate Agriculture Committees earlier this year. I wouldn't hold out any hope these bills will be passed. The powers that be in Congress are such that they can effectively block this legislation from coming to the floor.

My point before was that the bill that has been just introduced is a way of coming through the back door. It has been demonstrated time and time again in all arguments in this issue that the farmers are the losers, that the chemical companies have been leading farmers down the path of least resistance. It has been shown that farmers have dropped out of farming in California, in Texas. If they haven't been pushed out, the cost of chemical control of pests has risen to such a point that it is periously close to breaking them.

Now, if we can use the argument back against them, Mr. Poague, if you are indeed concerned about the farmer's ability to produce food, you must effect this legislation. We demonstrate this is what is needed.

I think this legislation is going to receive support because the Great Plains Agricultural Council for one, a highly political group in Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Kansas, they have direct lines of communication to Mr. Poague and Mr. Mannon on the House side and to the Senators from Texas, and through the National Cotton Council. I think we can pick up support from the southern legislators.

But we have done this by appealing to them with an economic argument. Don't hold out hope for the control bills. I don't think they are going to pass.

A VOICE: What legislation are you referring to?

MR. WAY: S660 in the Senate and S745 in the Senate. These are bills to control the manufacture and use of chemicals.

A VOICE: Are they the biological bills you were speaking about?

MR. WAY: No. What these bills would do is set up forms of registration that would require the users to demonstrate their qualifications in the use of chemicals, and they would impose upon the manufacturing interests certain requirements in the manufacturing of these chemicals to show they will not be harmful to the environment or at least labeled in such a way so that people would see that the user presumably would be qualified and what applications to use, how much.

A VOICE: What is the number of the biological control bill?

MR. WAY: In the Senate, the bill is S1794. In the House, it is 8159.

I might add another form of commercial, I suppose. Very soon we are going to be making a mailing of the bill and of the various documents in support of the bill to various groups throughout the country enlisting their support.

A VOICE: I'd like to switch gears for a minute and go back to the Office of Management and the Budget. Could you tell me who some of these people are and how they are appointed or voted in or what?

MR. WAY: They are not voted in. As far as I know, they are appointed.

A VOICE: By the President?

MR. WAY: I am sure they are appointed by the President. Within the administrative scheme, they are really not reachable directly.

MR. WAY: Sir, would you state the address where everybody can obtain the membership of various House and Senate committees.

MR. WAY: Of the committees? I trust that would have to do with the environment.

A VOICE: Yes.

MR. WAY: I am sorry. I don't have that with me. But what you can do -- if you would like to write out the questions, and if you want to mail it to me, that's fine. Or you can write to your own Congressman or Senator and just ask him for that. They could send it back. Address it either the House Office Building or the Senate Office Building, once you get it.

A VOICE: The Wildlife Federation has lists also. You can get it from them.

MR. WAY: There a number of groups that do have these lists.

A VOICE: If you are saying that the system won't work, you are saying that letters to your Congressmen don't mean anything; if you say that the letters are written to constituents by administrative assistants; if you say that once a lobby for a particular bill is successful and funds are appropriated and the system stops when the funds are taken away, what's the answer?

Now I have gone through the system many, many times and you see before you a person battered by the system. I worked in the system, with the system, through the system and I come up with a great big zero. What is the answer?

MR. WAY: I suppose I could give you my own ideas on that this morning and discuss an alternative to the present system. I've done this at length within our own staff and I have got some specific suggestions, but nobody will buy them.

The issue is really this: This country suffers a serious leadership gap and anyone who has worked within the system knows this is a cause of our frustration today and I could give what I think would be a beautiful speech in support of the change of the established order. I don't know how much it's going to do.

I don't know the answer to that. Really, I don't think that the system that we are working with is necessarily responsive to the needs of the people. I am not very optimistic we are going to get very far at all in the environmental movement. That doesn't mean we have to stop trying.

A VOICE: One woman from the Sierra Club on the National board said it took their organization a year and a half of fighting and fighting on one issue, the SST, and what do you know, it's back again. When your guard is down, boy, they're there.

MR. WAY: You're absolutely right. The point was before that there are lobbyists in this country watching this legislation every step of the way. They have full-time staffs in Washington, and if you let your guard down -- the case of the SST is almost like the war in the Middle East. The Arabs can wage war time after time after time. All they have to do is win once.

In the case of the SST all they have to do is win once, and the issue is gone.

MISS TAYLOR. There is a thing called a public opinion message, which is a telegram that anybody can send. It is limited to about 15 words.

My suggestion for the woman is this: You just keep in contact with the national groups. We are in Washington trying to fight the SST. We have proceeded on the premise that if something is wavering, lots of letters sent in to the office will at least show what the constituency back at home is feeling. And we also urge that people do send telegrams before the bill reaches the House or Senate. And I was wondering what you feel that effect is, if you are swamped with telegrams on the day the bill is going to be discussed.

MR. WAY: I think if there is a dramatic outpouring of telegrams and letters at critical times, it has an impact. In the case of the SST I think it happened last time. When those telegrams or letters were sent to the key people who were wavering on the issue and 20,000 pieces of mail were reported in a single day heavily opposing the SST, this certainly had an impact.

Thank you very much.

MR. LAWLOR: We thank you, Ron. We had to cut that a little short. We did it -- you are being schedule. You are now at a real seminar. The only thing I would suggest is that during our lunch break you get together with the people you would like to speak to and use that opportunity to find out what Ron pointed out, the problems on the legislative system.

And now I'd like to introduce a man who is very, very acquainted with the problems of dealing with the courts. At this time, if our wonders haven't ceased and Mr. Polikoff is here, I'd like to turn over the podium to our next speaker.

MR. POLIKOFF: Good morning to all of you. It's a pleasure to be here, although I must say I feel a little bit resentful and awe-stricken, both of these feelings being directed at Frank Corrado, who asked me to appear here this morning many, many weeks ago.

It so happens we have a lawsuit going, like today, with a brief due, like at 4:30 this afternoon, in court against the agency which employs Frank. And how on earth he knew this many weeks ago that the day on which we were all to gather here and which I was conned into saying okay would be the day on which our brief would be due, I don't know, but it's clear to me that his employers have no sense whatever of the value of Frank Corrado.

Although it's not part of my topic, which I will get into briefly in a moment, I can't resist a comment or two on the last colloquy regarding the system and concerning coming up with a zero on working within it. I just want to put a little perspective into that colloquy, and I speak as one who although working within the system in a sense would attack it, I'm sure, as vigorously as anyone.

I want to make two perspective observations with respect to that. And maybe the rest of what I have got to say will, taken as a whole, be a kind of a third such observation.

The first is that American is probably in the forefront of world environmental concern.

An Italian mayor -- I have forgotten his name -- from Turino, was over not too long ago. He may have been visiting with EPA among other agencies. He was just amazed at the environmental progress made in this country, the awareness that exists in this country of environmental concern, and the objective condition of our environment as compared with the condition, environmentally speaking, in other parts of the world. Italy is in large part a sinkhole. It is the rule, not the exception, for raw sewage to be dumped into the river, into the ocean, and there are virtually -- no, literally no industrial controls in effect, with respect to any of Italy's major industries, and Italy is but one example of that phenomena throughout the world.

If you think we are bad off or our citizenry isn't making progress, apparently the rest of the world is far, far behind us, and that's relevant from a perspective point of view.

The second observation is that some of you have got to read the just unbelievably gripping effective column that Ton Wicker wrote in the New York Times a year or so ago shortly after returning from a trip to Eastern Europe. If any of you want to get ahold of that write or see me.

I will give you a quotation. Returning from a trip to Eastern Europe he said of America that "here people can still assemble peaceably, still march militantly, still express their views and have an impact."

We do have an impact, and that was visibly contrasted with the situation in Eastern Europe, that is, under other systems, systems not like ours, or rather where the entire ballgame is totally different. And there are so many of the Eastern European countries that are not addressing their environmental problems. Romania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, are doing nothing simply because somebody in the Commissariat or Economic Advisors or whatever they call them over there has made the determination that the economic concerns of the country or political or social or military reasons are more vital than the environmental concerns. And this is the decision and there is no significant way for the citizenry to address themselves to that decision. And that's my second comment on perspective.

Well, Ithink what I am supposed to talk to --

A VOICE: On your comment on the perspective. That's what you're supposed to show us, how far we can go. I'm not the least bit satisfied or placated by your perspectiv in terms of the rest of the world. It is a fact we ar in environmental trouble and we cannot worry about what the rest of the world is doing. Look, we are spending time saying what our perspective is. I am pretty sure we have a good idea of what it already is in terms of the total environment.

(Applause.)

MR. POLIKOFF: I agree with what the speaker said, and I made my comment not to turn anyone off or out of the struggle. I have precisely the same viewpoint that you have expressed.

When a lady says she has tried the system over and over again and has come up with zero, I think that's an inaccurate statement of what can be accomplished by working on environmental problems, and I think there have been some victories.

We are in terrible condition and I take second place to no one in making that assessment and documenting it. We are in terribly bad condition, but we shouldn't risk the kind of defeat at the same time that was raised in that answer, and thereby lose troops for the battle. That's my point.

Now, going to court. I see the first thing I want to say about going to court is that it's not the exclusive tool, as I'm sure others have told you -- but it always ought to be thought of as a possible avenue of approach in conjunction with and in addition to other efforts. Just because a legislative effort is underway or a public confrontation effort is underway, is no reason not to carry the weapon of litigation in conjunction and in addition to those other efforts.

Secondly, and I don't want to appear to be reversing what I just said, but lawsuits should be carefully selected and not indiscriminately filed. There are a lot of reason for that, but perhaps the most important one is psychological, and it relates to my previous remarks again about turning off the troops. Pessimism and weariness tend to develop from loss after loss after loss. And it doesn't do anybody any good for ill-conceived and ill-considered lawsuits to be brought, so that the use of this weapon, while it should always be considered and always be thought of, should be carefully considered and given careful thought before it is used. Well, those are vague generalities, I know.

Specifically, what do I want to tell you about going to court? There are two kinds of lawsuits. One kind is the specific lawsuit that emerges out of a specific local problem that people are really uptight about and want to fight about. There is an asphalt batching plant down the block that stinks up the whole neighborhood and the people in the neighborhood are really excited about this, and they want to stop it. And, you know, they will be with it in terms of financial support and appearing in court, and the use of other mechanisms in conjunction with the lawsuit I have mentioned in this kind of instance, even though the problem is very specific and perhaps even a very, very local one, in the experience that I have had a victory won't have precedential implications for other litigation around the country or establish any new principles. It is wise and desirable to have it brought preferably with local attorneys. A winning lawsuit can be an important to community organization, and local wins against the government are greater, particularly again with respect to the kind of defeat. And if you know about where you are going, that generally rights itself after a series of losses.

So that kind of lawsuit is important to be brought and should be brought, but only when there is that kind of support behind it.

It will be contraproductive to move into such local efforts in my judgement without that kind of support.

The second kind of lawsuit is the lawsuit that's designed to strike at the jugular of the system.

It picks out an important issue of principle. Victory will make a difference, not just with respect to one asphalt batching plant, but with respect to the way the system, the anti-pollution system is structured and the way it works. Frequently, such lawsuits attack the top administration in Washington, the way they are handling their programs, and they seek to bring about a change in the conduct at the top.

An example of such a lawsuit is the one referred to earlier, where we are attacking the standards applicable to Lake Michigan under the administration's new Refuse Act program. Victory in this lawsuit may be very remote, but victory in this lawsuit would result in changing in a very fundamental way the rules of the ballgame for all of Lake Michigan.

Now, with respect to either of these kinds of lawsuits, you have got got to be thoroughly and completely prepared on the facts and on the law. That means you are going to sponsor lawyers, but it means more than that. So many of these lawsuits tend to be brought by people who are working as part-time volunteers.

It means sticking with it, you the citizenry sticking with it and insisting the kind of thorough and detailed performance be given to the lawsuit.

It means raising money to hire experts. In environmental lawsuits, as you all know, scientific evidence may be crucial. It means almost always getting someone on a volunteer basis. It means enlisting the help of university professors. There are a number of them around the country, Joe Sacks here in the Midwest is one among several who are sophisticated about legal theories and who help lawyers on the firing line immeasurably.

A half-baked effort in this respect, failure to prepare adequately and thoroughly, failure to have high enough standards of expectation for your lawyer, to insist that he prepare adequately, to have further witnesses to consult, will mean disaster for the reasons I mentioned.

So I say that at this time my final piece of advice about bringing litigation is: Make certain it's carefully and thoroughly and winningly done.

I can speak first in generalities to you about the nature of litigation or about specific issues, as to which litigation could apply, and I will do so if there aren't any questions. If there are any of you who feel moved at this point to ask specific questions, I would pause and have some of those.

MISS TAYLOR: Don't you think that your qualifications of being extremely well versed in the law and carefully prepared and also the fact you have to long term financing and interest commitments precludes the average environmental from bringing a successful lawsuit?

MR. POLIKOFF: Clearly not. That couldn't be more wrong. The financial expenses need not be great. They will be within the scope, within the possibility of most really concerned environmental groups.

If the court costs can't be raised, and if you can't find a lawyer on a volunteer basis, and if you can't find an expert on a volunteer basis and a consultant on a volunteer basis. that is because you are not concerned enough and your group is not involved enough about the problem. Any group that really has an issue that it wants to bring, in my experience at least, will find it possible.

It may take some time and some doing to mount the kind of realistic and significant chance of succeeding effort that I am talking about. There are lawyers in this state and other states who are available on a volunteer basis, and from personal experience I know if there is a well-conceived effort and if the expert is approached in the right way -- even experts, incidentally, and this is a problem, are somewhat concerned about exposing themselves in litigation because so frequently the opponent is the government and so frequently there is research money coming from the government. Only that kind of expert, from personal experience I can tell you, will be available on a volunteer basis if approached in the right way.

And there are organizations around town, ours being one of them, but by no means the only one available to give you the kind of initiating expert assistance that is necessary to tell you how to go about it and how to start. It is a long-winded answer to a short question.

To repeat the first part of the answer, if you have the kind of troubles you discussed, it is because there isn't enough involvement on the part of the citizenry.

A VOICE: How does the local group go about locating the environmentally interested lawyer who will give them service?

MR. POLIKOFF: There are two ways. One is from within our_own groupsif it's a local issue. That means the local citiznry is involved and in the local citizenry there oughtto be a lawyer.

If it doesnt develop there is, I'll just list you examples.

There is the Environmental Law Committee of the Chicago Council of Lawyers, an active organization and an active committee.

The Businessmen for the Public Interest are heavily involved in environmental litigation and, while very short on staff, can assist in putting you in touch with lawyers who will handle environmental matters on a volunteer basis.

It could well be that the larger citizen organizations, CAP, for example, the League of Women Voters also have -- well, I think they have a working relationship with lawyers, largely on a volunteer basis, and through those organizations and their lawyers you might well be put in touch with lawyers who would be willing to serve. I think we have a chicken and egg question here, as we always do when we get down to basics. But a well-conceived, soundly based litigation effort will almost never go wanting because of a lawyer. Rather, ill-conceived efforts are going to meet with difficulty in finding lawyers to take them on.

A VOICE: I'd like to here more about the degree of success that has been achieved in judicial actions in the past and also the possibility for delay in the appeal.

appeals.

MR. POLIKOFF: That's a good question. There have been a number of successes. The barge canal was a preliminary effort. That effort was begun by litigation. The litigation, though not particularly successful, resulted in so much focus of attention on the issues that the canal did not go forward and incidentally and parenthetically, that's an important point to make.

Litigation can and frequently is successful in terms of the broad objective, even though technically there is a loss in court. The reason is the spotlight of publicity can be focused by it. People become aware of issues. Legislators become aware of issues they wouldn't be aware of or weren't aware of before, and policy may be changed as a result, therefore, of unsuccessful litigation.

The number of lawsuits which specifically have had success in the environmental fold is not miniscule. Let me just give you a few examples right out of the air.

In Memphis, Tennessee, the Secretary of Transportation decided in his wisdom to put a park -- excuse me -- to put a highway through the park, and the citizens in Memphis, Tennessee brought a lawsuit.

The lawsuit was brought a number of years ago, two, three, I guess. The lawsuit went all the way up to the Supreme Court, the citizens losing all the way. They won in the Supreme Court. Meanwhile the construction of the highway had been enjoined and the Supreme Court said the Secretary had failed to articulate the reasons for his choice and ordered him to do so. That lawsuit must ultimately result in moving the highway to a different location. It may not, but the citizens have at least gotten their day in court, and given all the time it's taken, the chances of it succeeding are reasonably good.

And there is a number of such instances of litigation around the country that has succeeded. That's another observation about litigation: technique, and strategy.

Lawsuits can be classified in these two ways: You are trying to stop something from happening or you are trying to bring about something that isn't happening in terms of delay, which is the second part of the question.

Delay may work in favor of the environmental plaintiffs as well as against them, depending on which category of litigation you are in. In the case of the Memphis highway, delay was obviously working in favor of the plaintiffs. In the case of the barge canal and others, this same phenomenon exists.

In the case of Lake Michigan, the lawsuit I mentioned earlier, it's just the reverse. Lake Michigan can't stand delay, and we are trying to get prompt attention. Delay is a two-edged sword.

MR. WAY: Actually, if a case fails -- now I bring to you the case of Lake Superior. Within one area the Lake Michigan Federation had two thousand paid members that went to court. We watched the battle in two harbors and they had the expertise and had gotten witnesses from all over the place. It was extremely well prepared. Regarding my lack of faith in the system, you must forgive me. I attended every meeting of the City Council -- I am a pro at it. I have worked within the system, and sometimes you win a few but you lose more than you win. The big ones, like Lake Superior where you have national focus -- and they are still fooling around, they are still going to buy time.

MR. POLIKOFF: I didn't mean to pick on you at the beginning. The answer is simple. We can't afford to become dismayed and disheartened because we lose more than we win.

I guess it was Ron saying a moment ago, is it always true if we lose we can keep coming back again. We do and we don't have to give up any more than the other side has to give up. It's true that the citizenry is an overwhelmingly difficult problem in terms of organizing and maintaining continuous support, as compared with those on the quote, other side, unquote, who are in the cab of power with their hand on the throttle all the time, and I don't mean to be naive and I hope you don't read me as suggesting that good guys always win. Nice guys have been known to finish last more than once. I am tempted to pull out here one of the nine laws of a disillusioned liberal, which is that last guys don't finish nice.

I recognize the strains of defeat and likelihood of defeat, but there is no alternative. There is no way that I know of other than fighting within the system while simultaneously trying to improve the system and when you lose, to go back again and again and again.

And the only alternative would be a different kind of system, qualitatively different, not just an improved system, but a qualitatively different system. And speaking very personally here, I have no faith in that for the reasons Tom Wicker mentioned earlier and I think that comment with respect to the rest of the world isn't irrelevant either.

It is not pure accident that we are in better shape than the rest of the world, and incidentally, when I say that I make no prognostication as to where the world is going to be environmentally 25 years from now. I have, I think, as much concern as the next fellow and as much uncertainty as the next fellow about that question. I view that as, at best, an unanswerable question at the moment.

But I think part of the reason we are in better shape than the rest of the world -- bad off as we are -- is that we have had the abilityto get out there and fight and take defeat and come back and fight some more, and we have a system that permits fighting.

Here is my antagonist again. Yes?

A VOICE: I think I have had quite enough of a lack of prognostication or doomsday outlook, the negative fight. I have had it fighting within the system. I have had it.

There are possible programs available. There are possibilities where you don't have to bother with fighting within the system, because there is no fight. There is something to be done. We have the tools and the personnel to do it. We know what the answers are. I don't see any reason to spend time fighting. If we just come together and do what needs to be done, we will get the job done. Taking about the environment 25 years from now is a farce. We can't fool around that long. Not only don't we have the time, it isn't necessary on questions of social policy, economics, and anything else you want to bring up.

We do have the manpower in the world and the technology to solve the problems. We are dealing with --

MR. POLIKOFF: We have got the manpower and we have got the technology, and we have got it now.

And the world has never had a nice, simple procedure to bring all that together and make it work.

A VOICE: I beg to differ with you, it does exist -- Environment, Inc.

MR. POLIKOFF: Maybe you're not understanding the point I am making. Ron Way has described to you the awkwardness, the neanderthal of our cumbersome system. The solutions have got to come through that kind of system. We are going to have that kind of difficulty until we can change that system.

A VOICE: I don't believe we have to work through that system in that manner, and as soon as we get enough people that will stop believing in that fallacy and stop --

A VOICE: Is it possible to ask him for an alternative?

MR. CORRADO: We are going to have to add 15 minutes or so on the lunch period.

A VOICE: You have made it known about this -- would you have a few words of advice about citizenry and people tactics that can be used in the field of nuclear health and proliferation?

MR. POLIKOFF: The nuclear power plant area is just one small part, in my judgement, of the water pollution problem, and at the moment an important part, but not the most important part in the Midwest. Here is an area where environmentalists can have some hope as to what will happen. The Environmental Protection Agency has taken a strong stand, as you know, against thermal pollution.

I think that was a reflection of victories that the citizenry was beginning to rally to, the significant victory at Pallisades with Consumer Power Company's power plant near South Haven, Michigan followed up by a similar agreement covering radioactive waste disposal, thermal pollution by Commonwealth Edison with respect to their Dresden plant; the voluntary action to construct cooling towers by Indiana Public Service Company; Detroit Edison's voluntarily taking significant steps with respect to its planned nuclear power plant, and as far as what I know of what the citizens did in that area, it appears to be one in which they do care a very great deal.

The precedents are now established for intervention in the atomic energy state and licensing board hearings. After the Pallisades victory, the intervention of a small number of environmental intervenors brought about a prompt agreement from Commonwealth Edison Company with respect to its Dresden plant on radiological discharge standards that were approximately 10 percent of what the AEC had been prepared to allow. In my own mind I am thoroughly convinced that their present acquiescence was brought about by what the citizens' groups had done with respect to Consumers Power Company.

You will recall that these hearings went on for nine months before an agreement was finally reached and the agreement amounted to a substantial sum with respect to both the radioactive waste issue and the thermal issue, so you happen to have picked one area in which there have been some hopeful developments recently, largely instigated and brought about in my judgement by citizen action.

That may be the best example and not a typical example by any means of what is going on with respect to citizen action in the environmental area, but it is one illustration, at least, of the view that positive accomplishments can be brought about through citizen action.

A VOICE: Wasn't that partly due to the small size of Consumer Power and Electric Company?

MR. POLIKOFF: I doubt it. Consumers isn't all that small, although it certainly is not one of the giants in the utility industry. But Consumers fought vigorously with high-powered, knowledgeable lawyers.

I think that the fight that Consumers put up was a vigorous fight. They certainly didn't give in easily or promptly.

A VOICE: But that's still such a small gain. Let's talk about a big organization. Let's talk about U. S. Steel, or the Detroit area.

MR. POLIKOFF: Detroit Edison, I have already mentioned, has taken positive steps. U. S. Steel has been subjected to an injunction brought by the Illinois Attorney General, which has been delayed -- which has a five-year implementation. I think that is a poor order, because I don't understand what U. S. Steel would have been willing to agree to.

I think Ralph Nader has shown us dramatically that giants can be stopped as well as the smaller ones. I just do not believe that sound, well-conceived lawsuits are going to fail us because the industrial opponent is big rather than small.

Is there anything else? I am going to leave it to Frank to decide whether we have a further debate here on the alternative to the system.

MR. CORRADO: Thank you all. I think if it's all right, we can tack five minutes more on. We can come back at 1:15. I'd like that gentleman to come up who had a suggestion and talk to us.

First, I'd like to ask you to stick to the schedule. We will come back 15 minutes later, at 1:15 p.m. rather than 1:00.

I didn't introduce Mr. Polikoff properly. He was the attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union who was successful in the CHA case in Chicago. He is one terror to deal with, I must say.

If this gentleman would come forward -- Mr. Ron Way would like to make one statement as well.

Miss Taylor and Mrs. Rome, I want to thank our morning speakers.

MR. WAY: I'm sorry if I came across as a defeatist, that certainly was not my intention. My whole point is, don't be satisfied by sending a single letter; you must follow up. I am not optimistic we are going to beat this thing.

Don't be satisfied with a clean-up campaign on the city. Get to the heart of the matter, recycling, non-returnable containers.

One small issue I just wanted to raise -- although I am not satisfied with the system at all, I am satisfied that for better or worse, we are going to have to put up with the damn thing and try to do what we can with it.

I count the defeats; the victories should be there anyway. And so I hope that with that outlook, I can implore you to continue going forward.

MR. MC CLODEN: My name is Jim McCloden. I am from Environment, Inc., 327-1091, here in Chicago at 630 West Sheridan Road, 327-1091.

I am not going to give a speech as to an alternative. In the past the groups have gone about their work with the best of intentions. However, because they are small, independent groups, the effort has been fragmented and, of course, it has been ineffectual.

Our hope is to cause a coming together not only of environmentally concerned people, but the people who are in power as well, not only in government, but in business, the people who are behind all of the various technological planning and design that is going on in the world today. There are products and systems being designed all day, every day that are coming out. The real solution to the problems that we have, we don't -- I should say, we don't have to persist in worrying about what the environment will be 25 years from today. We must put ourselves into a comprehensive, 100 percent program, starting today.

We do have a program, and I'd like to hear from you, because we have made lots of plans.

A VOICE: It seems from the list of speakers we have had here today, no one has chosen to concern themselves with a style of life change that seems to be implicit in all the new ecology. No one has articulated this. What is your organization's stand on this and how do you see that being effected?

MR. MC CLODEN: That's a discussion that I would rather not get into right now. I don't feel I can come up here and off the cuff go into this. The subject of life styles is very relevant and something we have not addressed ourselves to in the past.

As I say, it is something we will have to -- mankind -- address ourselves to, because the main problem is education, educating ourselves away from our old established ways of training about our behavior. That's our main problem, if we continue to think about our problems and behavior in the same frame of reference. We need new answers, because the problems are new, even though the source is very old. It is new and we can't deal with it in old terms.

Does anyone have a direct question?

(No response.)

(Whereupon, the above proceedings were recessed, to reconvene at 1:15 o'clock p.m., this date.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

MR. CORRADO: This afternoon we are going to hit on a new angle called Working on the System. Maybe it's all part of the angle.

Our first speaker is one of the top pros in the Chicago area. Mrs. Lambert Botts, Lee Botts to most all of us, is with the Lake Michigan Federation and the Open Lands Project in Chicago. She is a former editor of the Hyde Park Herald. You can call her a gadfly if you want to. She actually is a person who is concerned about many things, and she has one of the most sophisticated ways of communicating and dealing with groups of anybody I have ever run across. And her topic for this afternoon will be generally on organizing, community organization work. We are real happy to have her here this afternoon.

MRS. BOTTS: Thank you very much, Frank, for those kind words. Just because we haven't hit you over the head yet doesn't mean you have to call us sophisticated.

I am a sophisticated executive. I am Secretary of the Lake Michigan Federation, which many of you are familiar with. It is a four-state organization set up to promote citizen action in regard to preservation of Lake Michigan in the four states around the lake.

I am going to refer to the Lake Michigan

Federation frequently. It's my case history, so to speak, and I will tell you something about the history of it and try to relate it to the principles I want to discuss with you in terms of citizen action and community organization.

There are three ingredients necessary, in your experience, for successful citizen action. The first one is an issue; second, people who care about it; and the third is communication.

Now, we have found it most successful to organize in terms of a particular issue. That is not always possible. The Open Lands Project, for example, which is a Chicago area organization and the parent organization of the Federation. The Open Lands Project was set up originally in a different way than the Lake Michigan Federation, and in my discussion I will try to explain the difference. And I think it accounts for some of the difference in history.

The Open Lands Project was set up around an idea, the preservation of open space, not in terms of the preservation of a particular piece of open space. Therefore, the Open Lands Project was in a position in its beginning, eight years or so ago, of looking for an issue, and again, to have an impact with the system -- if you want to use the vernacular -- after it had found an issue and could organize people around an issue.

That brings me to the next point, people who care about an issue. And this is the first principle to remember, is that you and the people who care about the issue have to have a relationship. To put it another way, the closer an issue is to home, the more people can identify with it personally, in terms of their own desires, the easier it will be to organize. You can't always find such an issue. You don't always have such an issue at hand. But when there is an issue like that, it is invaluable.

We believe Lake Michigan is such an issue. This is the reason why we were discussing whether to attempt to organize on a regional basis, across state lines. We decided not to organize what some people had proposed -- it was described as a Midwest Environmental Council. A Midwest Environmental Council would mean a lot of different things to a lot of different people. I believe the time time will come, and it may not be very far off, when we will be able to organize a Midwest Environmental Council and we will be able to deal much more broadly with issues than we were since we organized the Lake Michigan Federation.

But we decided to go ahead because Lake Michigan is a problem right now. It's a problem that

that means a lot of things to a lot of different kinds of people, and that's another point to remember in looking for an issue: The narrower your issue is, the smaller your group will be.

One of the things that can happen and does happen is that if you are successful in organizing around an issue that's close at hand and has a lot of personal meaning for people so people do become involved, then that organization can address itself to other issues.

I think the Sierra Club is a classic example. The Sierra Club organized to accomplish a particular purpose and is now accomplishing not only that but a good many other things nationally, and we hope that the Lake Michigan Federation will be able to follow that same path, having been confronted with an issue.

And sometimes an organization happens in response to an issue that is already there. The Save the Dunes Council in Indiana, which has been one of the most remarkable conservation organizations in terms of its persistence, long life and success in dealing entirely with volunteers over 20 years, came into being because a number of people were confronted with an issue rather than going out and looking for an issue.

The next thing is to become informed about the facts. These are platitudes. I don't believe I am saying anything that is news. All I am going to try to do is relate them with what's going on with the Lake Michigan Federation now, because we do seem to be having some success in accomplishing our goals.

This means acquiring the facts, and not only acquiring the facts about an issue, but finding out who has decisionmaking powers in regard to that issue, whether it's government, citizen groups, whether it's an administrative agency, regulatory agency, regulative board, it's critical to find out who is going to make the decisions, and then once you have found out who is going to make the decisions, you probably will be able to discover or realize what kind of action will make a difference.

In terms of the Lake Michigan Federation, we are working in terms of some of the limitations with which we are all confronted now when we are trying to work with community organizations on environmental issues, social issues, housing, or whatever, and that is the attitude of the Internal Revenue Service that there is something shameful about lobbying. We don't think so in regard to getting funding support from foundations. I will come back to funding later.

We do have to work in terms of the Internal Revenue Service regulations, so that for the Lake Michigan Federation our way to take action is information communicated to the people who care about Lake Michigan. And I think the brochure has been distributed to most of you which describes our purposes, and it also says what we are going. That is, we are simply telling people when and where and how decisions will be made and how they can take part. This comes back to the business of an issue that's close at hand, that people have a personal stake in the outcome, and I know if we carry through the next they want to know is what can they do. In terms of people who care about the issue it's important to assign roles or to determine what the roles are for the people who are involved.

In my case I am fortunate in being able to work as a professional, and working full-time my job as a professional is to serve the volunteers who are working with the Lake Michigan Federation. The service that I provide to them includes suggesting to them things that they can do that ought to be done and ways that it can be done. But it means that the purpose to the kind of role I have is working for a lot of different people.

I am responsible to an Executive Council, which consists of people from all four states. We are working on this kind of geographic basis and we have a particular communication problem in that we have to constantly work at letting members of the Executive Council know what is going on. There is one idea about the Federation which is both a limitation and an asset, but which is crucial to the Federation, and that is that the Federation has been set up to provide information and to encourage other people and organizations to take part in the decisions.

The Federation will not take a position on an issue that does not concern the whole lake. It means that we take a somewhat lofty attitude. We will take a policy position in terms of the whole lake and encourage other members to act on it. We will not take a position that affects only a small area.

To use some current issues on which we will not take a position as a Federation, we will not take a position on the Clavey Road Sewage Treatment Plant. We will give all the information we have to anyone who inquires, be it some affiliates on one side or some on the other side.

We will not take a position on the extension of the Michigan City Power Plant. We did tell a lot of people about the hearing that was held and attended by some 800 people, which was quite a turnout for Northern Indiana.

We did not take a position on the Pallisades nuclear plant. We did help the people in Michigan find assistance, legal assistance in Chicago in prosecuting the Pallisades nuclear plant.

There are people who are very impatient with us because we won't take a position about an issue that is the closest at home to them, that pertains to Lake Michigan. We believe in the long run we will be more effective if we remember what your role is and don't exceed it and are consistent, and it's not easy, because we care about a lot of these issues.

I mentioned the problem of communication, if it's a problem, with members of our Executive Council. But it works two ways. When people care about an issue and they care enough to belong to an organization, it's the object of the organization to give those people something to do that will make a difference in terms of the goals of the organization and its needs.

To be specific -- and this is the reason as I look around at some of the organizations set up a year or two ago in terms of working for the environment or working on some particular aspect of the environment -- it seems to me that those who have given their members something to do, and repeatedly, not just one shot, but keep them encouraged as to what they can do, are the ones that have survived, and some of them are thriving, while it's those organizations that did not define their goals, that had a vague idea that they wanted to do something to improve things and did not consistently give members a specific task to accomplish that are not doing so well.

These days the biggest motivation for continued action is success, and when you do succeed, it's important to let your members know what part they had, and I can't stress too much that you never can succeed unless your members have supported you and worked for you and vice versa.

It's important to stress that success, and the Lake Michigan Federation is stressing these days the fact that the Environmental Protection Agency did make a recommendation to protect Lake Michigan from heat. It was not only the efforts of the Lake Michigan Federation by any means. It was the effort of a lot of people. It was an issue, a broad policy issue that we worked very hard on, and as a matter of fact, we are beginning to pick up steam every day we meet new memberships.

Today I was very gratified that we got a membership from Paul Douglas, from the South Bend

Tribune; we got a membership from the UAW, and we got other memberships from a lot of individuals who, I don't know who they belonged to.

The fact that people with so many different kinds of interests care enough about Lake Michigan to join in such an abstract thing as the Lake Michigan Federation means, I'm certain, that those people who heard about the thermal issue are going to hear a lot more from us in the future on other issues.

The third thing that I stated was essential for success was communication. You'll think most of what I have been saying is in terms of communication: communicating information; communicating things to do; communicating with success. There are some other kinds of communication that are essential in terms of successful community organizations.

One is communicating directly with the decision makers. The leaders of the organization need to know who the decision makers are and be known to them. There has to be someone who is available for consultation, someone with whom to exchange information, someone to carry messages, someone to whom to say you are happy or unhappy. And so one of the first things an organization needs to do is to make contact with the people who you hope to influence, whether it be a regulatory agency or legislators or leaders of industry.

If you have defined your goals in the first place and know what you are doing, you can be very friendly with a guy and fight like heck.

On the other hand, the Lake Michigan Federation is organized on the principle if we can't talk together, we can't solve problems together. We are trying to maintain communication with those people with whom we are in opposition.

Currently, one of the major projects of the Federation is to try to get a public discussion going on power. We are concerned that a public policy be developed to safeguard Lake Michigan and the environment of Lake Michigan for future, as well as being concerned about what kind of decisions are being made right now about the power plants that are already built.

We have therefore invited the utilities around Lake Michigan to join with our affiliates in five different locations in discussing these matters in June. There will be workshops held. I hope all of you get an invitation from somebody or other. The workshops are being organized by local affiliates of the Federation -- the St. Joseph-Kalamazoo area, Gary, Chicago, Milwaukee, and assistance and guidance from the Federation headquarters. Each workshop will follow the same broad outline. Each workshop is being organized in terms of the local situation, in keeping with the principle that the closer to home an issue can be related, the more likely you are to get people to respond to the issue.

And maybe the fact that the utilities agree to participate will mean certain things getting out on the table so we can talk and discuss things that were not out on the table before. For example, the question of whether there should be any agency established on the state or federal or regional level to decide where to put power plants. We had been unsuccessful until we started power workshops in getting Commonwealth Edison to tell us where they are located. They don't want anything to change. They want everything to stay the way it is. In the workshop simply by participating they will be forced to consider with us what kind of change there will be. Time will tell whether we can succeed in accomplishing any change at all.

I have already talked about defining roles. It's also extremely important to define goals. Not even the Congress of the United States can deal with everything very well. They slough over lots of things and so forth. However, some committees or subcommittees of Congress can deal very well with parts of an issue. I'm not suggesting that one should slice out tiny parts and constantly separate. If you take one part and succeed in dealing with that, you will be in much better shape for dealing with the big question. But what can you accomplish if you don't know the people you are to reach to get to help you?

We feel that regular communication, that communication is very basic, and I have already talked about communication with decision makers.

One of the most important functions that the Federation is serving is to provide the means of communication between government and the people who are working with the Federation. By "government" I mean regulatory agencies and administrative agencies and Congressional people and so forth. We are constantly being asked for information by administrative agencies. We are constantly being asked for references. We don't feel that we have sold out if we discuss with the Corps of Engineers their plans, for example, their plans for developing a regional waste disposal system.

The Corps said to us that they counted on us for support when they made their plans public. We said, "Don't count on us for anything unless we are in on making plans. The result of that is we are now meeting with the members of the Corps involved in making the plans. We have made no commitments, but we know a lot more than we would have if we had turned our backs and walked away when they approached us.

I understand this morning Ron Way of Senator Nelson's office said that he didn't think letters to Congress made any difference. Our experience is to the contrary. On the thermal issue, for example, it was Senator Stevenson's office who told us they had a flood of mail and all other Senators and Congressmen from the four states had a great deal of mail on the thermal issue. We think the fact that they had so much mail on the thermal question was the reason they were responsive when we asked them to help us on the Refuse Act Permit Program.

The Refuse Act Permit Program, I'm sure most of you know, will implement an executive order requiring that permits be given on the discharge of industrial effluents. According to the executive order these permits should be given if dischargers meet water quality standards. As we are convinced that present water quality standards insure the death of Lake Michigan, we have requested, because of the critical condition Lake Michigan is in, special conditions be established for this lake. We feel it is justified in terms of the irreversibility of major change in the biological systems of Lake Michigan and because of the importance of Lake Michigan for natural resources and so forth.

Because we were organized and we knew who cared, we were able to reach those people in all four states around the lake who were prepared to go to Washington to discuss this matter with the agency that will carry it out. That's the Corps of Engineers, Council of Environmental Quality, and the EPA, specifically the Office of Water Quality.

Because we had communicated concern about the Refuse Act Permit Program and what it involved, when we called these people and said we think we need to go to Washington, we were able to find people who knew enough about the issue to respond on very short notice.
We were able to take delegations from all four states to Washington to meet the representatives of these agencies.

We were encouraged by the fact that the Corps said they agreed with us. They asked us to submit our evidence in writing in the form of a legalistic brief which set forth the facts. We were prepared to do that because we had been spending some time informing ourselves about the facts. We knew what the water quality standards were; we knew what had happened since 1965 since the water quality standards were enacted; we know what the scientists are predicting will happen to the lake if present trends continue, and so we were able to put this together and present it to the Corps. We didn't receive much encouragement from the Office of Water Quality and still don't have a final answer from them on this issue, but what we did was, while we were in Washington members of the delegations from all four states went to call on the Senators from these four states. They went to call on them not simply in the name of the Federation, but in terms of their local organizations.

This is very important when you are dealing with Congressmen. That's the old "closer to home" principle but operating in a little big different way. And the staffs of the regulatory agencies with whom we had been dealing were amused when a couple of days later they received a letter signed by the eight Senators from the four states around Lake Michigan, Republican and Democratic Senators, all supporting the request that we had made for special conditions for Lake Michigan.

This is the current issue, the outcome of which is not yet certain. Therefore, we are continuing our efforts. For one thing a lawsuit has been filed against the Environmental Protection Agency and Corps of Engineers claiming that what they propose to do is unlawful and giving the reasons. The Lake Michigan Federation is not a party to the lawsuit.

A number of the members of the Lake Michigan Federation, both organizations and individuals, are parties to the lawsuit which has been filed by the Businessmen for the Public Interest. Again, it was a matter of communication. When the Businessmen for the Public Interest decided to file this lawsuit and they wanted to find people who would be interested in participating, the fact that we were organized and knew who would care about it, we were able to suggest possibilities to them. They made the contacts and so forth, but we are going to do a lot more than that because of the importance of this program for Lake Michigan. We are going to organize all around the lake for people not directly in the program.

Some of the things we are going to do, we are already at work on setting up mechanisms monitoring each and every application that comes from around the lake. We are going to tell our affiliates in each location around the lake what they should look for in terms of these applications. We are going to make certain that every application gets looked at so we will have none of the situations with which we have all been confronted. That is, something happens and we find out about it too late and react to it.

We will provide assistance in analyzing the effluents, if that becomes necessary. We will not only monitor each application that is made, we are going to make sure there is an application for each outfall. This is a situation that requires a good deal of help, but also will strengthen our organization because we are going to have an awful lot of jobs and an awful lot of people to do them.

If we succeed in this particular program, I have every confidence that the Lake Michigan Federation from then on will really be a force to be reckoned with. Each and every person who works with us on accomplishing this goal will have a stake in the outcome. They will be able to see we will have given them a way to act on their feeling for Lake Michigan. And that's really what community organization is, the interest channeling of citizen concern, if you want to call it caring about an issue, or whatever.

I want to talk a little bit more about the question of funding and the Internal Revenue Service and so forth, because it's a matter of critical importance.

The Internal Revenue Service regulations say that even though businesses can deduct their lobbying expenses as business expenses, non-profit organizations cannot lobby or spend more than a very small proportion of their time lobbying and be eligible to have a tax deductible status. The foundations will not make grants to any organization that does not have a tax deductible status.

The critical difference is that the Lake Michigan Federation tells people what can be done and what the facts of the issue are. We don't tell people what to do in terms of legislative action. That's up to the initiative of the people who are involved.

There are many, many citizen organization already existing. There are many more potential citizen organizations who need to know what to do, so this comes about to be a matter of defining the goals of the organization and the roles of the organization. There are limitations, obvious limitations in this approach. We should be with it and dealing in terms of it right now.

I'd like to try to answer any questions that anyone has about anything I have said or anything about the Federation. The folder that I passed out to you is an invitation to join the Federation. It illustrates the goals and purposes of the Federation.

We are going -- we are working very hard -- we will continue to work very hard to broaden our base. It's important to have leadership, but it's futile if you don't constantly attempt to bring more people in.

This is another situation that organizations sometimes find themselves in. When you are continually confronted with problems and you know who the people are who will respond and you go to the same people. You have to keep going to other people too, especially citizen organizations, which by their very nature depend mostly on volunteers. There are some volunteers who find it possible to keep working on the same issue for the same cause year after year after year. There are many more that just get burned out.

A VOICE: Would you consider pesticide runover an issue to the Lake Michigan Federation?

MRS. BOTTS: Yes, it's an issue that we are very concerned about. One of the things we are trying to is to -- there has been some evidence recently brought for recording the sources of pesticide runover. We have played some role in trying to get the study going of the sources of runover and a means of controlling it up in Dorr County, Wisconsin.

A VOICE: There is a study that has been done.

MRS. BOTTS: You are talking -- I don't know what you are referring specifically to.

A VOICE: Of pesticide runover and sources.

MRS. BOTTS: In Dorr County?

A VOICE: Around the lake.

MRS. BOTTS: The Technical Committee.

It wasn't very specific, and we still don't know how, in terms of the geologic structure in various parts of the lake, still don't know how to deal with what is already in the water. What the Technical Report Committee stated, we still have a lot of pesticides, and even if we don't add any more to the supply already there, we are still going to get a continued supply.

This study concerns the problem of septic tanks and waste runoff too in terms of groundwater supply. I don't say that's the whole answer at all. Many members of the Federation have worked very hard on the legislative proposals in the area. This is another kind -- example of the kind of issue on which we give information. We have answered many, many inquiries about pesticides and directed people to sources of information.

A VOICE: Back to the funding business, is there any way of getting around lobbying restrictions?

MRS. BOTTS: We are doing that in a way. We are using the Federation itself to educationally arm our affiliates. We are trying to, instead of organizing new organizations we are trying to bring the service to those organizations already in existence, that already have as a part of their concerns or all of their concern Lake Michigan. We do this because there is a lot of concern about competition between organizations and we don't want to compete with any existing organizations. If somebody else is doing something, we will try to support it, because there is no point in competing.

A VOICE: What I am asking is, are all these affiliates in a position to do political lobbying?

MRS. BOTTS: Yes, yes, and very, very effectively.

Another danger from putting all your eggs in one basket, so to speak, is, if you know somebody is going to speak up on your behalf, you will do it and be the spokesman. I don't think we would get nearly the support on the part of our affiliates as we are getting now, and we are very encouraged by the amount of response we are getting.

I mentioned there was discussion of an idea of a Midwest Environmental Council, and I still think this may come to pass some day. There is a group -- if any of you are from Minnesota or Northern Wisconsin, you probably know of it -- the Northern Environmental Council, which is a regional organization. It has many things in common with the Federation, but not exactly the same concerns. We provided in our by-laws for representation in the Federation for the Northern Environmental Council and for any other regional organizatons on which there was an overlapping concern. We just recently received a request from people on Lake Erie asking for information on how we were organized and so forth, people who want to establish a similar organization around Lake Erie.

It is quite conceivable that we could have a Great Lakes Federation or Midwest Environmental Council. Some of our affiliates are national organizations, the Sierra Club, for example, on the power siting issue and these things feed on each other for information. The fact that we have started our power siting workshops is a factor for the Sierra Club becoming more concerned with developing a policy on power siting. We are using some of the Sierra Club reports and proposals as part of the workshop and so on.

Service organizations have been conversely criticized a great deal in the past for being fragmented and for not getting technical.

We can see that we are just part of a trend. Really, I believe there is much more of a movement toward interrelationships and regional and national efforts.

SCOPE itself is a representation of that trend.

Are there any other questions?

(No response.)

Thank you very much.

MR. CORRADO: 427-4256, in case anybody wants to talk to her.

I'd like to know how many people we have from out of state. Would you all stand up, anyone from out of state?

MR. HAWKINS: Paul Hawkins, I am from Louisville, Zero Population Growth, Earth Limited, Environmental Action, from Louisville.

MISS WEBB: Mary Beth Webb, with the Michigan Students Environmental Confederation.

MR. COHEN: I am Richard Cohen, also with the Michigan Students Environmental Confederation, in Lansing.

MR. HERT: Chris Hert from Madison, Wisconsin.

MISS HARRIS: Linda Harris from Pennsylvania Environmental Action, Zero Population Growth.

MR. CORRADO: All the way from Pennsylvania, and Kentucky is here today too.

MR. BETZ: Bill Betz for Environmental Action, University of Michigan.

MR. CORRADO: We have some people from Springfield also. Could you put up your hands just so we can see who we've got here.

(Show of hands.)

A VOICE: How about Jacksonville?

MR. CORRADO: Jacksonville? Sir, do you want to identify yourself?

REVEREND SHOEMAKER: Reverend Richard Shoemaker, and I am really here representing Housewifes Interested in Pollution, HIP.

MR. CORRADO: Our next speaker -- I first met our next speaker in Grand Rapids, Michigan last fall when he came barging through a door into a meeting of Federal and State officials. This may be some indication of the kind of tactics his organizations uses in its campaign against pollution in Chicago.

If I were to in my own evaluation, which means nothing, to evaluate the effectiveness of groups in Chicago, I would put this group at the top of the list among groups that scare government and industry.

The Campaign Against Pollution was originally organized from efforts of people in the Industrial Areas Foundation from the Chicago area. Most movements start with somebody saying some famous words, and when the Chicago mayor said that an air pollution inversion we had a couple years back did not have any effect and didn't bother anybody, Mr. Alinsky of the Industrial

Areas Foundation was heard to remark, "What does he breathe with, his ears?"

We are real happy to have Bob Kramer here today.

MR. CRAMER: I rode home from Grand Rapids in a small commuter airplane with Corrado and a bunch of guys from EPA and was scared to death they were going to throw me out.

I bring you greetings from Pete Martinez. Pete is in Rochester, New York today causing trouble for Edward Loeglund, the Vice President of United States Steel Corporation, one of the world's greatest polluters, along with several other people from our agency.

Frank generally outlined what our organization started as. I'd like to discuss with you the tactics of confrontation, the kind of philosophy that lies behind it, and some of the general ways we go about implementing confrontation tactics.

CAP operates out of the basic notion that pollution of the environment is fundamentally a problem of politics and economics.

Now, it may be that a power plant, which is a technological entity, is causing a problem, but the way we manipulate our technology and environment, that way is decided through political and economic decisionmaking. As a result, we feel the way to get things cleaned up is to change the situation through political and economic action.

I'd like to say also that we basically see the problem as a bit broader than simply a problem of, say, pollution of the air and water. We operate from the notion that the real problem is how the political and economic system alters and manipulates that environment. And the fundamental problem, as we see it, is that people of this current age, at least most of them, don't have too much at all to say about the economic and political decisions that directly affect their lives.

Now, this is patently clear in the area of air and water pollution. People who run the corporations in this country, they dirty the air and water because it's free and it's costing a lot less because it's free to do that than it would to install pollution control devices. They make their decisions not on the basis of public welfare, but pecuniary gain and thrift, and in this instance thrift and public welfare are diametrically opposed, and people who have to breathe the air, drink the water, and swim in it and so on don't have anything to say about it. We think that kind of thing should be changed.

This same problem presents itself in all sorts of areas. Very few of us in America have anything to say about whether we are going to drive private automobiles on the highways we have paid for, or have a good quite fast rapid transit system that is cheap and acceptable to us. Very few of us have anything to say about the fact that we clog our downtown area with gigantic buildings even though we are going to have to live in the area, work there, and breathe the air. Those buildings were built because the land downtown is very expensive and people wanted to get the most out of their money when they built a building.

Very few of us in American have anything to say about what kind of medical care they have or whether their neighborhoods degenerate or just about anything else of major importance for their lives. This pollution issue is brought into wider context for us and the only way we see that kind of problem can be solved is by organizing among masses of people, all strata in this country, to take that power back, to take control over their lives, and that means political fights; it means political struggles.

I would first like to say a few words about the kinds of ways we go about organizing people.

The first principle we work on says you have organize people about issues that directly affect their lives, not with esoteric slogans or ecosystems or whatever. They have got to be organized around the air they have to breathe every day or water they have got to drink that is turning into junk or recreation areas being closed because the water is unsanitary to swim in.

Now, I think that's not because people are unconcerned with more esoteric matters, but the fact is the people in this country have got to be first of all concerned about things that directly affect them. In all of those cases, the issue has to be one that directly affects people, one where they understand whatever demands you want to make are going to help their lives. They have heard a lot of slogans for years by the government and haven't gotten any action.

Secondly, from our standpoint it seems to us that people will not move very far if preached at. Most people know pretty well they don't like the air to be junky and the water to be algae soup. They want their environment to be nice and you don't have to preach at them.

And they also know that it's not their fault, they didn't make the decision that U. S. Steel would dump 61,000 tons of junk on them in their neighborhoods every year, and they have nothing to say about it. So they don't need to be preached at. Rather they should be reminded of the immediate concerns they have noticed to be related to the larger issues, to the targets, to the sources of the problem. That is, they need to be organized in a fashion that does not divert them from the real cause of problems these days.

For that reason we feel like clean-up campaigns are okay and so on, but the real crux of the question should be directed at the source, the people who have power to change the real systems of how waste is disposed of.

We should go over to outfits like United States Steel and confront the people that have the power to decide not to dump the junk in the air and who have the responsibility for dumping the junk in the air in much greater portions than any individual could do.

So the second thing then, as far as we feel at least, is to direct people to the real targets and to organize around a demand that involves the real targets. People around the country are diverted all the time. You've got people on the southwest side who are scared to death of the onrush of the blacks from the ghetto next door. When people are fighting among themselves they are diverted from the real targets.

Thirdly, you have got to convince people that change is possible. The reason most people are pathetic, at least in our minds, is that they don't know the environment is deteriorating. They don't realize the magnitude of the situation. That's clear mainly because they are either cynical about the possibility of change -- they think the system is immutable -- and the system does a great deal to strengthen that impression. So they are either cynical or scared.

The United States Steel South Works Plant -- people will not go individually to attack that corporation. They know what is going to happen if they do. We have seen it happen before; people are scared to death.

And they have got to -- we have got to show them that by joining together like the unions did in the 30's, they don't have anything to fear. They do have something to fear right now -- they will get fired -- they will get speeded up on the line. We have got to show them they can take action without fear, No. 1, and No. 2, when they do take action they can succeed. And that's the reason CAP goes into battle, not to win moral victories, but to win.

And that means something about the issues we we choose. We can't go about taking positions on every issue around. If we can't win on every issue, if we don't have the troops to win, we can take a position and fight around an issue where we fully intend to win; that is, to clobber the opposition, to force these companies to stop polluting the air and water, to force the government to be responsive to the people and so on.

One of the things that people do have to get a sense of is that changing things is political. That is, when you go after something you have got to go after it in a political sense. You don't try and convince the President of United States Steel Corporation that his corporation is an environmental villain. He knows that. He has seen all the facts. Even if he doesn't live in the community that breathes it, he knows.

What you have got to do is to make it in his vested interest one way or the other to clean up, and you do that by not making it in his vested interest to continue what he is doing. That is, you bring pressure to bear; you wield political power in any way you can rather than trying to convince somebody.

And people have got to sense that it is

their right to do this. It is their air and their water. It is not the corporation's air and water. He has no right to mess up that lake.

Commonwealth Edison has no right to dump thermal garbage in Lake Michigan, particularly without paying us, for God's sake, and then raising our rates 20 percent in the last two years. They have got to know this is a political fight they're in and that people have a right to stand where they do.

And finally, on this organizing thing, people must realize it's a political question we are talking about. Governmental politics is a question of the power, who has got the power. It's pretty much the same guys who do the polluting, the guys who own the corporations. So that government is hardly a neutral body, for all the good will of the lower echelons of the Environmental Protection Agency. Decisions are finally made in terms of power and unless you have mounted a pretty hefty campaign to force the government to change its position, the people who have the power inertia, that is, the people who run the corporations in America, who have controlled the money and wealth, who put the people in office, for God's sake, are going to win the day.

Moving on with the tactics and strategy that an outfit like ours uses, the tactics of direct action, at least from our standpoint, involves using just about any political club one can to bring the foe to his knees. I hope you don't mind these martial references, I don't mean to come off like some kind of General Patton. This is the kind of sense -- you are in a political battle -- when you go after one of these outfits and you have to use all the guns you've got. I want to make clear also that political action, for us at least, does not mean back-room shenanigans. That's the way things are usually run, right? It means doing things in public, with the public participating, bringing as many people who have a right to have a say in these decisions into the decisionmaking process as possible.

Perhaps I can use as an example the kind of tactics we are using against United States Steel and draw out some of the principles we use to determine what tactics we are going to be using.

United States Steel Corporation is one of the biggest industrial steel corporations, making -- I think they sell four and a half billion dollars of merchandise every year. They agreed seven years ago to end all of their pollution. The catch was, from all of its currently operating equipment at the South Works. Today there are only two pieces of equipment left.

That was seven years ago, seven years and 63,000 tons of junk. Today they dump 61,000 tons.

We feel, given the fact they are the largest producer of particulate matter in the Chicago area, they deserve to be a target, and we won't tolerate this kind of environmental degradation any longer, and there are a lot of people around who feel the same way.

Anyway, to go after United States Steel, we first looked at the name and saw, my God, what are we going to do. United States Steel doesn't sell directly to us and you can't boycott a four and a half billion dollar corporation. What do you do? After some kicking around of angles, we started to come up with some ideas. I will run through some of them.

First of all, it turned out, after investigating their Board of Directors, that a gentleman by the name of Gordon Metcalf was on the Board of Directors. Gordon Metcalf is also Chairman of the Board of Sears, Roebuck & Company. He is also on -- concerned with a variety of other outfits, which makes him a pretty important fellow.

Gordon Metcalf, as the major executive of a big consumer store, has no desire for us to be dragging Sears, Roebuck & Company into the United States Steel controversy, particularly when they have Stewart Udahl on the television screen several times a day to demonstrate what an environmental prince Sears is.

We demanded several times to meet with Metcalf. He didn't want us coming around Homan Street where the head office is. Finally we got a meeting with Metcalf. He said he had no responsibility, he just made decisions on matters of the budgets. We said, "You better quick get responsibility for South Works. Sears is going to be dragged into this all the way from Lake County, Indiana to Lake County, Illinois." This was not at all in the vested interest of Gordon Metcalf.

It turned out that Edward Loeglund, who is Vice President of United States Steel, is a big Presbyterian. In fact, he is such a big Presbyterian that he is running today for Moderator of the General Assembly of the whole countrywide Presbyterian church.

Last year in the environmental frenzy the Presbyterians passed all sorts of resolutions about the theological and moral implications of pollution and encouraged their members to go to their employers and demand that all pollution be stopped.

It seemed to us that that was kind of contradictory for Edward Loeglund to be head of that outfit, so we have begun to fight a battle, which will culminate in Rochester, New York, against Edward Loeglund. Ed wants to be Moderator and doesn't want to be embarrassed in front of the rest of the Presbyterians.

We wanted to get negotiations started with United States Steel. All the time they were saying they would talk. Sure, they will talk. They will tell you what they have done. We got the Presbyterian church here in Chicago, on pain of great suffering, to pass a resolution that they were going to try to bring us together to negotiate, which they did, and Ed Loeglund hasn't negotiated yet. And that is the reason we are in Rochester.

Several months ago, since Parky Cullerton, the County Assessor here in Chicago, has such a fine record of underassessing big outfits, we thought we would check into U. S. Steel's tax payments.

U. S. Steel, it turns out, is underassessed to the tune of 73 percent, $12 million of taxes every year. That's a lot of money; that's enough money to have cleaned up pollution several times over. It's really not, it would take several years.

This was spread all over the papers, and so we went to Cullerton and demanded action and so on. Now Parky is going to have to reassess this August, and the longer we yell about it, the more he will have to point in terms of reassessing the general rate. The longer they hold out, the more it's going to cost, and the more we are going to yell about it. And that provides a real material incentive for the company to get on the stick.

Now, another thing is we want to try and bring people into this whole business, into getting people all over the city to have reason to have wanted that $12 million. For instance, as you know, the schools are going broke in Chicago. We figured out that the School Board would get about four and a half million dollars of this tax break. Most people name a school after you when you give them four and a half million dollars.

We thought we would go to the school board and not only give them four and a half million dollars, but demand that they go get it. We are trying to mobilize PTA's all over Chicago and advisory boards to demand that the school board go after this money. The same thing applies for the park district; the same thing for the City Council. It is very difficult on the City Council to get anything in Chicago. We had to stall our attempt to get this brought out so that wouldn't give Mayor Daley the right to shut his microphone off when they were talking.

At any rate, we feel in order to do this it's necessary to have our local chapters -- we have chapters all over Chicago -- go to the local alderman, the Democratic alderman, and get some kind of commitment, so that Paul Wigoda, the Chairman of the Committee will receive a call from him demanding he take this out of committee.

Maybe I should draw a couple of points out of the examples. In the thing with Sears, we feel it very important to try and balance institutions off against one another. If you have got an institution with power like Sears you can use them and try to get them on your side, whether they like it or not, and make it in their interest to bring pressure to bear on the people you are fighting.

On the Loeglund thing, we also feel it's important to push these issues, corporate executives who hide continually behind the corporate veil. And we feel the time has come when they have got to take personal accountability for what they are doing to our air and our water, so we go to these people and put them on the spot. "Ed Loeglund, it's your responsibility as a Presbyterian to clean up the air and water and we are not going to let you off the hook."

People normally get much more upset about that attack than they do about attacks on corporations.

Next, when we have confrontation, we want it to be public. We don't want the kind of confrontation that is behind closed doors. These people have a right to be there. That's the kind of confrontation we want. We don't want people to say, "Look, I'm all in favor of this," that routine. This doesn't do us any good.

We want him to get a meeting with such and so. We want him to guarantee us this will be done a week from now and so on.

Finally, we feel the media are of major importance. The only way in this society for lots of people to know what's going on is through the media. Flyers and stuff downtown, they don't get to many people. Newspapers and television do.

That's precisely what these corporations don't want who spend millions of dollars on corporate images, to have themselves dragged through the mud on public media.

The media want stories and we are happy to give it to them. They usually want action stories. They want confrontations, and that's what we would like to give them. We feel it's very important to do this kind of thing at least once a week. These outfits have got to know you're not going to go away, and

At any rate, we feel in order to do this it's necessary to have our local chapters -- we have chapters all over Chicago -- go to the local alderman, the Democratic alderman, and get some kind of commitment, so that Paul Wigoda, the Chairman of the Committee will receive a call from him demanding he take this out of committee.

Maybe I should draw a couple of points out of the examples. In the thing with Sears, we feel it very important to try and balance institutions off against one another. If you have got an institution with power like Sears you can use them and try to get them on your side, whether they like it or not, and make it in their interest to bring pressure to bear on the people you are fighting.

On the Loeglund thing, we also feel it's important to push these issues, corporate executives who hide continually behind the corporate veil. And we feel the time has come when they have got to take personal accountability for what they are doing to our air and our water, so we go to these people and put them on the spot. "Ed Loeglund, it's your responsibility as a Presbyterian to clean up the air and water and we are not going to let you off the hook."

People normally get much more upset about that attack than they do about attacks on corporations.

Next, when we have confrontation, we want it to be public. We don't want the kind of confrontation that is behind closed doors. These people have a right to be there. That's the kind of confrontation we want. We don't want people to say, "Look, I'm all in favor of this," that routine. This doesn't do us any good.

We want him to get a meeting with such and so. We want him to guarantee us this will be done a week from now and so on.

Finally, we feel the media are of major importance. The only way in this society for lots of people to know what's going on is through the media. Flyers and stuff downtown, they don't get to many people. Newspapers and television do.

That's precisely what these corporations don't want who spend millions of dollars on corporate images, to have themselves dragged through the mud on public media.

The media want stories and we are happy to give it to them. They usually want action stories. They want confrontations, and that's what we would like to give them. We feel it's very important to do this kind of thing at least once a week. These outfits have got to know you're not going to go away, and you have got to keep the heat on them.

Let's see, I've got two or three more. We feel it's very important to cut through euphemisms. These outfits have held on for so long using legal jargon and technical stuff to cloud the issue. The fact is that technical and legal jargon is used for the most part, at least from our experience, for the same reason that the syndicate uses it to hide what is really going on.

United States Steel Corporation in Birmingham, Alabama caused a major inversion together with several other steel companies about a month ago. They wouldn't shut down the plant because they didn't want to lose money. They have got blood on their hands, because eight people died as a result of that inversion. They are no better than common murderers. That's the kind of talk for which there is no euphemism. We have got to talk about what they are really doing to people.

One other thing, and that is about research. We feel it is important for this kind of organization and operation. Particularly, research is important, No. 1, to know what the issues are. A lot of people do. That's what is really important. It seems to us political research is to know who is doing what. It is a great deal of fun to do this kind of research.

You might not know anything about real estate taxes in Chicago. If you want to find out what kind of tax break a corporation has, if you want to be able to prove it, you learn about tax breaks very quickly. You learn a lot more quickly than if you took a course in it and that's the kind of research that needs to be done. And a lot of students can do it.

I guess that wraps it up.

A VOICE: I came over yesterday afternoon from Holland, Michigan to Milwaukee. There was a woman with me who had driven from home. She told me it took her two and a half hours to get to Chicago. How can it take you two and a half hours to get to this area?

She said she was allergic to smog. Her eyes started to tear and she started getting bloody noses, and she had scabs in her nose from this. I thought to myself, this is pretty bad. You know, this type of thing is totally unexcusable.

MR. CRAMER: We agree. Our number here in case anybody is interested is 929-2922. We have chapters throughout Chicago and we also have a southeast side affiliate group that are fighing around the steel works and the United Steel Workers are also fighting with us.

A VOICE: Is there any possibility -- you mentioned the idea of blood on the hands of U. S. Steel in

Birmingham. I can see a lot of difficulty that would be encountered. Is there any feasibility of having people arraigned or arrested or brought into court for physical harm?

MR. CRAMER: As you know, the laws of America are made by the people who do the polluting for the most part. We took a group of people down to the meeting with Mr. Ruckelshaus last Monday. I went there not particularly because I cared to hear Mr. Ruckelshaus -- does anybody know the political history of Ruckelshaus?

He was a favorite Republican in Indiana, kind of like Ray Page, a favorite Republican who lost.

We wanted to know what Ruckelshaus was going to do about the question of pollution from U. S. Steel. We went there with the intention of getting a commitment. All Ruckelshaus said was that EPA couldn't do anything until 1975 because the way the laws work, the only way they could do anything is by showing there is a health emergency in the area, the way they did with Union Carbide.

We got an agreement from Ruckelshaus to meet with a delegation from our group, which takes place tomorrow, to see if we can't set up a case on this line, but it's very difficult.

A VOICE: In other words, corporations can't be held responsible for personal abuses?

MR. CRAMER: You have got to prove they did it. It is very difficult in pollution matters.

Joseph Wright, a Harvard grad from the U. S. Steel staff of lawyers taught a seminar recently for the American Bar Association here in Chicago on how to stall in pollution cases. I understand that the Commonwealth Edison lawyers were taking notes.

A VOICE: It seems in this particular area of direct confrontation you have to be very careful not to alienate groups of people or government agencies or those who in some way would be advantageous to your cause. You have to get them behind you instead of alienating them.

MR. CRAMER: We do try to involve as many people and types of people as possible.

The only people we take care about alienating are the people doing the polluting, and in point of fact and in the final analysis there are very few of those people around, so far as running the big corporations. Say one out of ten we might hit with a real demand and really put in a tight spot might end up not liking us. Most of them, when they realize we have enough political power to do them damage, fall all over us. Oh, some of them get very uptight -- the point is, I think most people have not tried to alienate anybody. Among the masses of people in Chicago, not too many people are alienated. Some people are too militant, but that's the kind of trade-off you have to make unfortunately.

A VOICE: Government agencies too?

MR. CRAMER: Well, the EPA, let's say, has been very cooperative here in Chicago.

The other day, after the Ruckelshaus meeting -- we were very busy last week and were unable to get back to the EPA office. Mr. Van Herzberg, who is the head of a pollution outfit in Chicago, called about a meeting.

Due to the EPA's past experience with us, they got very concerned when they did not receive a call. Van Herzberg called our office and wanted to know when we were going to have a meeting. He was very nice.

Now, Mr. Van Herzberg is a very busy man and he has a lot of things to do. Now the fact that he knew we would cause trouble for him if he didn't come across, I am sure, played a part in his decision to try and get a meeting started, the fact that we stick to our guns and the fact that he knows he will have trouble on his hands.

It's the same as the old principle that the door that makes the loudest squeak gets the oil.

I think they will find that we try to force them to live up to their responsibilities.

Thank you very much.

MR. CORRADO: I would like to have our news media panel come up here, and we are going to have this presentation and then we will take a break.

I would like each one of these gentlemen to come up and give first of all a quick explanation of dealing with people, of how you deal with environmentalists.

We will start with Mr. Draeger, then Mr. Pearlman, then Mr. Dorfman.

MR. DRAEGER: The subject here is dealing with the media, and Spiro Agnew knows how to go at that, but I suggest you use other tactics.

I gather the whole thrust here is to develop some practical methods for you to become more effective, and I will try to talk briefly in those terms. I imagine to date you have gone into the progression of the environmental movement and you have probably agreed by now that it's in a different phase from that of a year ago. I think you are at a stage where groups such as you represent are critical and think what is needed is some sustained pressure on the polluters and on governmental agencies that have the power to bring the pollution to a halt. I think you will find the news media generally reasonably responsive, at least. I think most of us are decent enough people. We sometimes need an idea we're not doing the best job possible in this field. We do have some limitation of space and time and deadlines and limitations of our own.

I think we do have to tell both sides, and I think you realize that. I think to the extent you recognize these problems we have every day, we will be able to work better with you.

I am not sure exactly where we fit into the scheme of things. We are not your allies in the strictest sense. We are in principle, but I can't run into the U. S. Steel office with Bob Cramer from CAP screaming at Ed Loeglund. I have to retain some degree of detachment, so we are in a little different part of the spectrum. I think if you really plan to make this productive, you might want to devote a lot of it to questions.

I am not certain exactly the kind of things that are troubling or concerning your audience here.

MR. PEARLMAN: If I can, I'd like to give a pointer or two or some ideas on how to get specific on the broadcast media, and that leads me to say that perhaps the segment of this portion of the seminar dealing with the media should also be entitled Working within the System, because Chicago broadcasting, as with Chicago's newspapers is big business, and with any big business you need to know some angles and contacts in order to get anywhere.

When I was told by Mary Canavan that you would be a group of environmental activists, it was a point in your favor. You have to do something active to get on the air these days.

As with the print media you have got to let the editors know beforehand, if you can, that you will be doing something newsworthy. Send a press release to the assignment editor -- not the news director -- the assignment editor makes the day-to-day decisions. Send the press release to the assignment editor. Tell them briefly in an outline form who, what, where, when, and maybe the why of this event. Include a phone number, maybe two phone numbers, so the editor and reporters know who to contact. If the event is in the Chicago area send a copy to the City News Bureau

Give your news event a little extra something. The U. S. Steel case took some different angles when CAP went after the tax structure.

Try to arrange something visual for the TV crews. A plain news conference is what TV reporters call "talking gourds," just an opening and closing mouth.

For radio and TV you should have an articulate spokesman. Give phone numbers where this person can be reached and encourage in your news release that this person be contacted.

From the standpoint of when to release your story, there are a few guidelines. We also have deadlines. Radio news has no read deadlines, but just as with TV, there are peak audience periods, drive time. In radio it is called drive time simply because most people listen to the radio in the morning when they are getting read to leave or are driving to work and at night as they drive home.

So between 9:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. is an ideal time for your news event. The morning and afternoon newspapers can still cover it. There should be no problem in getting film processed for the 5:00 news broadcast. Also, remember other newsmakers will be using this time also.

If you have a news event at night, remember that phone number for the press release. If you have it at night have a phone number so if a radio station has a reporter to go out on the street he can call that number or get his story by telephone.

A few final words. Environment is still a fairly hot story in general, but it needs a different approach. It needs some impact.

People are more aware of environmental problems. Ralph the radio listener and Tommy the TV watcher are easily bored and frankly, may not be listening that closely. So be exciting, don't be offensive to the viewers. In your presentation avoid words and phrases that you and I might know but the average listener doesn't, such common terms as B.O.D., eutrophication, -- they can confuse the broadcast audience unless presented in detail. I avoid the word "variance" and even the word "thermal," because someone who hears the word "variance" might not know what it means. You and I know, but people listening might now. They should be in the more detail reports that print reporters can and do give more justification to.

And finally, I am reminded of two stories. One story is about two reporters who were in the Congo waiting for Dag Hammerskold to arrive by airplane. They waited awhile, then filed their routine stories. They went to the bar. Sometime later they were told that the plane carrying Dag Hammerskold had crashed, Hammerskold was dead; he never arrived at his destination. Don't count your news coverage until it happens.

A years ago in 1965 a big, big New York public relations firm assembled a huge afternoon news conference presentation. Everything was ready, good publicity release space for the interviews, coffee and doughnuts for the reporters, they had everything. Only the newspaper really printed the story, because at 5:30 that evening, just before the 6:00 local news, all the lights went off. This was the day of the big power blackout. Don't count your coverage until you get it.

MR. DORFMAN: These seem to me to be pretty good rules for getting yourself on the tube and getting your cause on the tube. For the newspapers you would probably do better to develop a continuing relationship with the environmental writers who are assigned to that job full-time. I gather there aren't too many of those around. Do you do that full-time, Don?

Don is probably the only full-time broadcast environmentalist in town. But each of the daily newspaper has somebody who specializes in the environment and you should get to know who the person is at each of the papers and take him out to lunch, and do that sort of thing. That really works better than going through the city desk, unless you are having some sort of blowout or demonstration or something.

I'd like to come back to Harlan's opening note about activism. This really is a problem with the news media. By overapplying an issue for three or four months or a year, it sort of gets boring. I mean, we saw it with the civil rights issue back in the early 60's. We saw it with the early stages of the Viet Nam protest. I think it's probably true not only in those areas but the environment also. I know many other issues of public concern that the media aren't going to do anything about unless you keep them. In terms of normal media practice, keeping after them means doing ever more bizarre, strange and wondrous deeds, and just remember that the hottest media property relative to the environment these days is a fellow named the Fox. And I suppose you all know about the Fox. This is the guy who lives out in the Fox River Valley and doesn't like people who are screwing up the Fox River Valley and goes around stopping up their drains, and pours gunk on their floors and so on.

I noticed not too long ago that some national conference on the environment was publishing suggested tactics ecomandoes and such groups.

The media are your friends only so long as the environment continues to sell newspapers, and I say you have got to keep this in mind.

MR. CORRADO: Do you have some questions for these gentlemen on dealing with people on a direct basis?

This kind of illustrates the idea that people are very tuned in to the media. I think I might like to ask you gentlemen a question across the table.

What are your major problems in dealing with environmental groups other than the technical problems of getting ahold of people? Is it the fact that issues are not presented clearly, or is it the fact that they are inconsistent. Standing off for a moment, how would you compare the effectiveness of these groups with effectiveness of the civil rights groups in the late 60's or the campus groups. Do you think they are having an impact on getting change?

MR. DRAEGER: One of the obvious differences between the civil rights movement and environmental groups, I think, with rare exceptions -- I would exclude CAP -- is this is not an action oriented thing. It is largely people using words at conferences and at administrative hearings before legislators. And it doesn't have this dramatic quality that Don Pearlman was talking about that is largely the heart of the news, the people acting and doing things you don't expect them to do or which are out of the ordinary.

Let's say that a proposal to protect the environment is coming up before a board that has the power to make a decision. You are going to find maybe

20 environmental groups stepping up to testify. There's only so much time television and radio broadcasters and newspapers can give to this. Not everything everybody says is going to be reported. There is too much of a crush of ideas and I think things get lost in the process. I have got one hint for you.

I think you ought to, as Ron Dorfman stated, establish a relationship with people who write and do broadcasts about the environment.

Maintain an informal relationship where you can feed them an idea and let them pursue it. Pride of authorship is part of all of us, and I'd just as soon have a good idea to pursue as the total package dumped in my lap, and I'm likely to help clear it with the city desk and give it a little push.

One other observation I want to make before I sit down here is I think it's possible for a group functioning in this field to be a figment of its own imagination. You have got to have an identity and a substance out of this media relationship. You can't be solely a creature of the media. And to the degree that you can walk both sides of the street, you will be more effective.

MR. PEARLMAN: I would agree very much with what Mr. Draeger has said. The anti-pollution groups seem to be taking a new approach. The Campaign Against Pollution, they were out there yelling and screaming, they go running into someone's office, they are taking a different approach. This taxation with U. S. Steel, this is fine. They are still getting faces and voices on the air and still getting the point across.

If you have someone too soft-spoken, there is no news, or if there is news, it gets buried. You have got to find a happy medium. Don't be a creature of the media. If you go to make headlines, you have got to have something beneath that headline.

It is nice to see that SCOPE is an organization that is alive and kicking and active and didn't go out along with the former Secretary of the Interior.

I would like to know, perhaps after this panel session, some of the problems you have on a local level,may be having on getting local media coverage.

There is no problem in the Chicago area where we have four dailies and two papers on the south side. If you are in a town that has only one daily newspaper and the newspaper publisher doesn't like you, your organization is in trouble.

MR. DORFMAN: I think probably the only thing I want to add to this discussion is to caution you, caution the environmental groups against getting swept up in what the media has sort of made the great brotherhood issue of the 70's, and there is no issue if everyone is in favor of a clean environment. And the tendency, I think, in the media is to want the environmental movement to be one of those things that brings us together instead of all the other issues we have that tear us apart, and it is kind of a salvation hearing that students and the United Auto Workers and everybody are on the side. If everybody is on the same side, what's all the fuss about?

And therefore, it seems to me -- there are necessarily heroes and villains, and we don't get off the hook by saying that everybody who drives a car is a polluter and therefore we are all guilty. That's like My Lai.

So I would urge you to keep the issues shapr and not to get sucked in to this sort of Jello. We are all in it together. We may all be ultimately in it together, but as of now we have got to have a fight.

MR. CORRADO: I have one more question -- first let me ask if anybody has a question.

A VOICE: I'd like to just ask whether my impression of this discussion is, as environmentalists we should not count upon the press to look for the intrinsic value in the movement that we may see as far as plying us with press coverage, but rather in the news story itself. That is, we shouldn't rely on the press to try to sustain public interest in environmental issues, but rather to push on environmental issues which are of themselves of interest to the public.

MR. DORFMAN: That is unfortunately true. It is shameful. We ought not -- in the best of all possible worlds we shouldn't have to wait for you to call us on the telephone. But in fact, that's the way it works because of the technological demand of the media, the economic demand of the media, and the tradition we have grown up with in gathering and presenting the news.

Ben Bendickian has a great sentence in which he says -- this problem is not particularly in relation to the environment -- but he says that we have been so long accustomed to the orderly standards of newsworthiness, which are an important person, a lot of money, a lot of activity, that people in people movements who don't have those characteristics -- a guy on the west side who can't call up and have 25 reporters and four TV crews at his house that afternoon -- if he has got something to say, he has got -- Bendickian says he winds up burning his draft card or burning his neighborhood or sometimes in burning himself to make a point in the media, and that's the crime, that's media's complaint against humanity, because that's the system.

A VOICE: Somehow I feel this relates to a statement that came from the floor this morning about one thing that we have not heard today, as to what extent is it necessary for us, in order to live with the kind of environment that we all hope we can have, is it necessary for us to change our lifestyles as a human race and as a nation.

To begin with, I think some of what you are saying is what is newsworthy as part of our society, you have to have money, you have to have charisma, or something. And I think the whole environmental movement has to get down to this level too, of changing value systems.

MR. CORRADO: Do you gentlemen in turn feel you can address your work to that point? Can you get that point across in your stories, or is it a valid point?

MR. DRAEGER: I think it's a valid point, and it's made by a lot of interesting people, a simpler life without all the plastic life and everything else that clutters up our world. I think the media, we are growing up slowly and I think we can deal with very fundamental issues like that. I don't think we have done enough of it to date, and I think it's one of the failings of my trade. My city editor put me on this beat. I think I was looking idle one afternoon or something. I am a general assignment reporter and I guess he knew I liked to hunt and fish and he decided that we will occupy ourselves with this awhile.

I really don't understand all this environmental stuff, but we've got to keep with it. I think there are really some fundamental things to deal with and ideas to get across and one of the things which I don't think has been explored and which may go by the boards is the notion, as within the civil rights movement, is that there was an injustice down.

In the past centuries we have abused our resources just as we abused black people in this country for centuries, and there is some retribution due people who have been abused.

We will have to put forth some effort and money and what have you to make up what they have done in the past. I don't think that fundamental concept has been launched on the public consciousness kind of thing. You ought to be doing it, and who knows, maybe I will or someone else will get down and sell that notion. I think we do recognize an intrinsic value in certain concepts, but it's kind of a harem-scarem business, and particularly in Chicago, where journalism is a little nutsy.

MR. PEARLMAN: Talk about changing lifestyles, two weeks ago Dr. Middleton was here. Dr. Middleton is head of the Federal Air Pollution Conference in Washington. He told a symposium -- I'll paraphrase -- it is time to realize that the automobile can't go everywhere in the city at all times, going back to the new air quality standards.

This made pretty big news on Chicago radio and TV, and the news is that the city may have to ban cars in the Loop during certain times of the day. It got some coverage and there were angles played on the thing. In the days that follow there will be no impact on these people until Mayor Daley, a year or two or three years from now tells the citizens of Chicago, "You can't bring your cars down here anymore. You will have to park four miles away." You can tell people they will have to do something and you might not have too much reaction.

They were warning people this week that the Kennedy and Dan Ryan will be reduced to two lanes for one hundred and some thousand cars. They can warn people now every day until June or July 12, until they start ripping it up, and come July 12, 100,000 cars will try to get to it.

A VOICE: I'd specifically like to ask the members of the panel some of the following types of questions, if they could answer them.

What are the media doing, environmental editors, full-time, part-time, environmental editors of newspapers doing both to inform themselves and develop a more factual base for their stories. What are they doing as far as network information they can share or communicate among themselves or throughout the states, such as Iowa's mass media environmental editor communication network? What advice would you have for facilities to make use of the information they have? How would you facilitate using media for such things, the public service announcements and general service announcements? How would you suggest preparation of paid advertisements, this type of thing?

MR. PEARLMAN: I think I talked about some of them, about sending press releases out. You share that way. If you can get press releases to editors a week before, that's helpful.

A VOICE: I think my question is directed to you Mr. Draeger.

MR. DRAEGER: The first question, if I understood you, is how do you develop sources of information.

I'm sure anyone doing environmental reporting is in contact with the Open Lands Project and is in very close contact with Frank Corrado so he can know what's going on, hopefully, with EPA; and various action groups, lobby groups; and also visits, if not in person, at least by telephone everyday to the EPA; the Illinois Pollution Control Board; various organizations. It was suggested that you take environmental editors out to lunch. We sometimes take government people out to lunch. Frank will tell you I have never taken him out to lunch. Also by environmental groups sending you fact sheets. The various local agencies who have their public information offices, and state agencies put out information -- so there is a continual flow of information.

Let me touch for a second upon the public service announcement. Here is a good point.

The Federal Government, under the FCC, says that radio and TV stations will make free time available or public service announcements available on the air. If you send a little bit of information -- a local church group is having a bottle drive, this type of thing -- send it to the Public Service Director and they will throw something on the air. This can be done with other groups. Someone is having an environmental seminar at the Pick-Congress Hotel.

A copy of that is sent to all radio and TV stations. It may get on 50 times, a combined total of 50 times over all the stations. That's worth quite a few dollars. Buying time, I would say the cost is prohibitve.

If you want time between 6:00 and 9:00 in the morning, one minute's worth of time is $250, $275. Multiply that by ten for the evening.

One minute of time on the Flip Wilson Show is $60,000 or $65,000. Go for free time.

Our first question was, what are we doing to be better informed. I am not aware of any network people in the media with concern in this field of any form. There have been some seminars for people in the newspaper business, but I think we have kind of resisted this, perhaps wrongly, but we like to plot our own chart.

As Don said, we have all read a lot of the same material and interviewed the same people here in Chicago. We have access to a lot of hearings and individuals coming into town who have something to say on the subject. So I think we are becoming better educated, if ever so slowly.

In terms of dealing as a practical matter with the operation, a lot of things that Don covered initially apply directly to the present media. You should learn who the individual is in the media, his phone number, where to reach him, the kind of things that interest him. You should learn his deadlines, the limitations he has, and you ought to be able to recognize with him what is going to interest the general public -- and there are certain things that do and certain things that don't. I would urge you to avoid gimmicks and repetitious efforts.

Something that hasn't been mentioned here -- obviously, a good fight attracts interest. You are going to have adversaries, and this attracts the new media, and this whole issue will get attention. But there are often occasions when a fad idea needs solid support. I can think of a few good ideas floating around in Springfield right now. There is a positive aspect of it.

If you can drum up a good campaign for something, I think you can get the attention of the media. Also, if you can focus on an individual, this is easier to handle and cope with.

And I think you have to recognize the fact that we are competitive. Anyone in this business likes the possibility of getting first crack at a story. So that's part of the track work in which you can operate.

One area which I don't think has been properly covered by the news media nor dealt with adequately by the environmental organizations, and this is the old baseball term of follow-through. You have government agencies set up to do certain things. You have individuals in government accepting responsibility for doing certain things. You give them a good law to operate under and then kind of forget about them. And I am saying that the President of the U.S., environmental groups, and the new media ought to do more of this business of taking stock and making assessments of what those government agencies are doing to protect the environment. I have given it a couple of credits, but not to the extent I'd like. I think that's largely an untouched area.

MR. CORRADO: Okay. I'd like to thank our panel this afternoon for taking time out -- I suppose for them this is kind of a vacation -- but I'm sure it was an effort for all of them to come here.

I'd like to take a five minute break. Please be back in approximately five minutes.

(Recess taken.)

MR. LAWLOR: At this time, I'd like to introduce Warren Muir, who represents a group known as Northwestern Students for a Better Environment. It's probably one of the best known change groups in the country simply because it more or less tripped off the entire phosphate campaign not much more than a year ago.

At this time, as part of our case study session of today's program, I would like to introduce Warren Muir.

MR. MUIR: Well, I'm not sure -- do people have copies of the annual report? Were those distributed?

Then I won't talk about anything that's in there. In fact, it probably won't be as much of a case study as a discussion on some of the things we have found that were reasonably successful for us.

Let me first outline a little bit of NSBE's history for those of you who are not familiar with it. It is a group that started a little bit before most of the others. It was formed by a group of faculty members and graduate students, scientists and public interest science groups. This was the nature of the theme that brought the people together at the time and it was not very long before energy on campus developed in this area. NSBE, which is Northwestern Students for a Better Environment is now primarily graduate students, scientists and people in the nearby communities brought together for the purpose of information dissemination to other groups, government, industry, schools, and the public.

My own personal feeling is that it has been a reasonably successful effort, at least this could be measured by the interest that the Army Intelligence has in the group.

Reasons for success I would say carries to our good timing, our very good personnel from Northwestern University and the Evanston community, which was originally not at all active in this area. The University had very very many problems with the Evanston community. The citizens had a great many environmental problems and very few environmental programs, so the area was ripe, and there was some fine organizational work within the group. It's this last topic that I'd like to talk about a little more than anything else.

Environmental groups seem to fall into two different categories. One is -- I would say the prime example in the Chicago area has been CAP, and you have heard from them. This is one that is not tremendously structured, but is a front line organization. It generates a tremendous amount of energy, and goes from project to project, U. S. Steel, Commonwealth Edison, this kind of thing.

NSBE is in the other category. This is one very much more structured organization, which is not a pure energy sort of thing. It is hopefully a long haul type organization, and I don't mean to say that one is more important than the other; I don't think they are. I think they work hand in hand. NSBE is not on the front lines. It is one of the organizations that tries to develop mechanisms and works with other groups. It is somewhat more removed, not the kind of group that is interested in getting a lot of publicity, although on occasion it does speak up.

One of the problems associated with volunteer organizations -- I have outlined sort of five, and I'd like to discuss them in terms of our particular type of group.

I think Bob Kramer did a fine job talking about volunteer organizations and tactics for confrontation, which is the other type. I'd like to talk about this type.

Recruitment of membership. This tends not to be a problem for a group if you have got a reasonably good cause and you can start with an initial nucleus. This is what initiates the group in general. Things carry along in that area and I will return to recruitment a little bit later.

The second, and this is perhaps one of the most important areas, is efficient use of manpower, and what is absolutely needed here is formal structure, some way to delegate responsibility within the group, some form of coordination. We have had problems and we have had to deal with the press. We have had problems with someone who is authorized to make statements on behalf of the group. We have had some people in the office for 15 minutes answering the telephone, and it's Harlan Draeger on the telephone asking a question, and the person makes some sort of statement in response bearing little recognition to anything that the group has any feeling for, and it ends up in the newspaper the next day and you are reading about it.

We are very sensitive to this kind of problem and so we have developed a prestructured organization, and in effect you will see it's a committee of committees. Each committee has a joint committee of each of the chairmen of all the committees, and there are but one or two people who can speak on behalf of the group, and otherwise things have to be approved. It's a very very set structure. The real difficulty you have with this kind of structure is to find people to fit into this structure, and this is the biggest difficulty we have.

You have to be able to locate people who can carry responsibility. I don't have any words of advice as to how you do that. It's absolutely necessary.

What you do is set duties and guidelines as to what people are responsible for. Our own particular experience has been that if one person is in charge of getting something done and something is dropped into the group -- in other words, the group is going out and strike for, say, a grocery store, which is maybe something that might be done, -- if this doesn't fall upon the shoulders of one particular person, it might not get done at all or it might get done in two or three days. Everything has got to fit in, to pigeonhole in terms of organization.

We do this by mailbox ourselves. We don't have any sophisticated kind of system. Every committee has got mailboxes and file cabinets and information is filtered from the mails and telephone and goes into the appropriate box and only the appropriate person handles whatever is necessary.

We found that it was necessary to develop guidelines and things for volunteers, people who volunteer to work in our library or office or file letters. We found it was necessary to make up an operations manual so people, when they type up a letter, know the kind of format, what kind of stationery, if a copy where should the copy go, and you must see that while this sounds awfully dry, it's a way of going back six or eight months later and finding out who is friendly, who is not, who is a likely source for funds, practically anything under the sun, who is interested in this particular topic, and the like.

The next point in the efficient use of manpower is communication, and I think I have heard this word about twelve times since I have been here since lunchtime.

We are very sensitive to the fact that we are a committee of committees and very structured, that sort of thing. One committee is doing one thing, another committee is doing another thing, and they don't have a sort of sense of the whole and don't have any feeling. It's like the arms of an octopus, one arm doesn't know what the whole body is doing.

We sort of have our own internal communications system, blackboard and the like, and it's one we found to be reasonably successful, but one which has had to be implemented, for example, by getting everybody together and having various arms reporting on what is going on to try and keep the whole operation in some sort of perspective. We keep rather extensive records. Practically every piece of correspondence is kept. It has been very useful in terms of finding out who we may contact by telephone or letter on a particular issue in a particular area, who has contacted us, who would be interested in information we come up with. For example, in the phosphate campaign thousands and thousands of people wrote for phosphate information.

Then we have something else; we have a Family Fleet, which is being reproduced, 200,000 copies of Family Fleet for people in households, household environmental hints, and it's very likely that people who are interested in a detergent phosphate list would be interested in a more complete Family Fleet.

We are able to get directly in contact with anyone who requested one of the lists by telephone or by letter and will be mailing those out directly to them, and it's always a way of keeping in contact with people who are actively interested in the activities of the group and who are possibly able to either give financial support to the group or who are interested in spending some of their own personal time and effort in your activities.

The third problem of volunteer organizations in general is the area of information sources and outlets.

Most of this is done by personal contact. We were fortunate that in getting started before many of the other organizations that were to follow on college campuses we were not in any sense closed off. We were able to meet a number of governmental officials and get to know them informally as well as people in the media crafts. So that was not a particular difficulty with us, and also many of these people are in contact with the organization. But it's these personal contacts which are very very important to the groups. They are the people we can tap for any particular sort of information that is necessary.

The other thing I would recommend for any environmental group is definitely to have a telephone and mailbox. It is our feeling that the telephone system is the world's fastest and most efficient information retrieval system available, and if you really sit down and think about it, if you want to find out anything practically on any level, be it from grade school on to college, say about an environmental problem, two or three telephone calls inside of an afternoon are likely to get you right to the information or source of information you are interested in. For your puroses, a telephone system is absolutely critical.

Wel, we have come to rely more and more in terms of our long-term efficiency on office efficiency and have found that the use of duplicating systems, telephone answering services, computer mailing lists are the ones that involve effort and time that is very well spent. We have spent a considerable amount of time developing formats and the like and putting people on the keypunch card, keypunching environmental groups' addresses, citizens' addresses, media addresses, newsletter mailing list addresses, and the like. And when they involve extensive lists, on the order of, say, 10,000 people, your time and effort put into developing this system are returned in about two mailings, and from then on it involves 10 minutes work of somebody going down to, in our case going down to the University Center, running off the program, and coming back with gummed labels and sticking those on.

A telephone answering service is one thing that I think hasn't been used by many environmental groups, and I think it is one that will work very very well. We are on the border of using that right now. We have had the problem of internal communication. We have had difficulties with the tremendous amount of information that is coming through the phones and people can't get through and want to get messages through. We have been able to find a person who has a little bit of electronics background, and for about $20 we will have a telephone answering service, which will save us time and a salary for a secretary or somebody who would otherwise be answering the telephones.

Well, we have relied on information sources as well as the library. This is not the rule in general. There are information retrieval systems being developed about and there are source people that are about, and environmental groups can take advantage of these.

We were very fortunate in being able to get a donation of a large number of private collections of environmental newspaper articles, journal articles, and the like and the donation of governmental documents, plus the fact that we were starting off in this effort has resulted in a number of charitable contributions to continue that work.

We are making an effort to set up what is in the annual report, a documentation center, our own databank.

Well, enough said in these areas. I have mentioned recruitment as a problem. A volunteer organization has also got the problem of momentum, and it is a problem. This is unfortunately the case, and perhaps it is especially true for students who are a little younger in the environmental area. It seems that students and people in general need to see immediate results from their own particular activities in order for them to continue their efforts, and it is this particular reason why you find very very few groups in existence on the campuses around the country of any stature at all. I think you can count them on the fingers of one hand; in fact, the number of reasonably successfully operating environmental groups in universities and so on.

You have got to worry about a momentum problem, and what this means is even though you may have priorities, certain group priorities, you are going to have to end up going into projects and doing things which are going to require immediate returns, even if they are lower priority items, in order for the group to sustain its momentum. This is unfortunately the case, but it is one you have to live with, and if you keep up this momentum, sustain this momentum, your recruitment problem is no problem at all. People flock to where the action is. You have to demonstrate even if it is a relatively unimportant problem. This is where the action is, and they can accomplish something directly with no effort.

And finally, in the area of problems to volunteer organizations is in the area of funding, and again, this depends very much upon the momentum. If you have a full operation, it tends to support itself for one reason or another.

When we got involved in the phosphate campaign, the phosphate campaign very much more covered its cost. The expenses that were incurred in the phosphate campaign were very much covered and quite a bit more just by those one or two dollar contributions that resulted from it. This has been the case in virtually every successful project we have taken on. If you can keep the momentum going, you can sustain the level of effort you have in the operation at the moment, and if we are to tackle reasonably large projects, if you can make it a large success you will be able to cover costs on that as well, if you have kept your records and you are able to show some sort of organization and if you are a non-profit organization or have access to a non-profit organization to which funds can be fed through. We are not a non-profit organization, but Northwestern University is.

A reasonably well organized group can go about and apply for funds, for capitalization, quantum leaps or steps in your activities. I think this can be done reasonably successfully if you can show you have got the records. I think you will find you will not run into too much difficulty in getting either Federal funds or foundation funds, providing you can show some sort of organization and be able to produce the record of your successes and failures.

Well, this is sort of the formula upon which our particular organization operates. Our own particular weakness is in the area of recruitment of scientific personnel. This is particularly the case because of the job situation at this time and because scientists in the university, graduate students and young faculty members have yet to see they can take environmental information dissemination and turn it into rewarding environmental jobs. For this reason they are very hesitant to get out of the labs and volunteer their extra time. I think that this particular situation is going to change. I for one have been able, for example, to secure an environmental job, and as this situation changes, as it undoubtedly will, people will not feel the pressure, on the university campus at least, to stay in the lab and to publish two or three more papers, for example, in their own particular area of science and their own particular journal, but will be more likely to spread themselves out and will invest more time in environmental activities. At least this is our hope.

And the other problem we have, and I am sure this is the case with all groups, we have a very difficult time finding people who are self-starters, enough people who can actually take on responsibility. We have a lot of people who have got ideas and want to get things done, but would much rather be spoon-fed what there is to be done. We are structured so that things can get done through the mechanism of groups, but there is no group upon which suggestions can fall. Every committee has a specific activity and is going off in particular areas. What we need is a person who will come in and say, "Look this is what you have got to be doing. Can you tell me how I can do it?"

We don't get enough people and you don't get enough people who can shoulder the thing or get in and start. What is badly needed for our organization is a person who comes in and says, "Look, the university can make money by recycling its gas. What mechanisms are available in the group by which I can go out and prove this to them?" And there is the phones and all sorts of facilities and people and contacts and everything we can make available. We need people actually willing to go out and do it.

For some reason or other, we will get people very willing to spend a considerable amount of time but the job has to be completely spelled out. You don't get enough of the kind of person who is a self-starter and a self-initiating person. Those are our weaknesses.

I'd like to throw things open for questions and answers rather than talk about specific programs of NSBE. You do have an annual report available to you.

A VOICE: I am from the Hyde Park-Kenwood Community Organization and we are just now -- we have had two meetings to determine the possibility of setting up an environmental group that would have subcommittees under it, and I was wondering how long did it take for that stage to sift down and have actual communication. Did you have a leadership force or did you have a group that said, "This is where we want to go," and go out and get a group?

MR. MUIR: I don't know how unique it is. We had some dedicated and sharp people that were very committed to getting involved in this area and our first meeting, their problem was they didn't know what the magnitude of the group was going to be. They decided they were first to tackle water pollution problems, for example, andthey had an air pollution committee. We had a couple of committees that had specific projects, but at our very first meeting it was decided you have to have an organization. We set up an executive committee and a constitution was drawn up. In the first two weeks there was a finance committee and a public relations committee; there was an office operations committee. All of the operating committees had to be set up first. As a matter of fact, there has been very little change in our structure since the first meeting of the group. In fact, the only addition we have had is a research committee. We have ad hoc committees which come and go. They are completely project oriented.

A number of these things come in and go out and we add and subtract ad hoc committees. We have got standing committees which we can get going right away. We can delegate people to do the day-to-day worrying about who our business contacts are in Chicago, do we need these sorts of decisions and so on.

A VOICE: Your personnel from other committees that get behind you. How do you get the troops?

MR. MUIR: As soon as you get any sort of project going -- we were fortunate in that we had Lake Michigan right on our doorstep. One suggestion is enough to draw in people. That has always been the case. We have never had the problem of not enough people signing up. Our problem has always been keeping the 30 people who signed up at the beginning. We don't have enough self-starter type people. You have to sit there and outline every specific thing. We don't have enough people who say, "This is what I want to, how do I do it," sort of thing.

I think one of the problems that has bothered my committee was that we were evenly staffed with people with a lot of environmental energy but almost no real experience either in research or in knowledge of the field they were trying to get into. We really had to start from scratch. At that point it is very difficult to get any tangible results. Most of the people we placed in committees were essentially informing themselves rather than going out and getting all kinds of environmental commitments. We can answer requests from the committee as they come up, but last year it was very difficult to sustain student interest in problems to which we had set undergraduates, because it is basically not very interesting. That is, digging through library references and the like.

I have time for one more question if there is one.

MR. LAWLOR: Thank you, Warren.

There are probably some things you can pick out from that and apply to your own group. I realize every situation is going to be different, but the idea is there may be something in one thing you can catch onto and use for the anatomy of your projects, so that if you are working on a specific project, if you have ideas on how to go about following through straight down the line on some specific issue to take it out of just the community level, maybe you can pick up some ideas here.

To explain what went on in the Pallisades project, we have an attorney from Chicago who worked very extensively on this project, Mr. Myron Cherry.

MR. CHERRY: I have been asked in approximately 50 minutes to dissect some nine months of hearings and legal battles, and although I don't think that's either very fair to you or to me, what I will try to do is explain to you the lawsuit that went on involving the Pallisades nuclear plant on Lake Michigan involving the whole issue of thermal pollution and radioactive waste.

I will try to hit some of the significant points which we used in both trying to raise funds and getting the public interested, and I would very much hope, if you would, pinpoint your questions to some of the things that you might find of interest in terms of strategic citizen action.

One year ago, Lake Michigan and presumably other large bodies of recreational water were looked upon by the Atomic Energy Commission and utilities as heat sinks into which hundreds of thousands of gallons of hot water would be discharged without any danger.

Approximately a year ago today, the utility industry was planning to encircle Lake Michigan with some 18 nuclear power plants. Now, as a result of a negotiated agreement between Consumers Power Company and several citizen action groups, an agreement which the Atomic Energy Commission acceded to, the future of Lake Michigan so far as nuclear pollution is concerned, as a recreational and clean water source is a bit more secure.

The case had a large effect upon some of the national issues, but how did it start?

In early 1970, a group of citizens, in the beginning and reality a doctor who worked for a large drug company and several fishermen, became concerned with the fact that Consumers Power Company, the largest utility in Michigan, was also going to build the largest nuclear reactor ever before built, and its intended operation in the process of generating electricity would result in the intake from and discharge into Lake Michigan of a substantial amount of heated water. How does this nuclear reactor work?

Simplistically, there is at one end heaters, which could be radium, coal, or gas, and they get the water hot and create steam. The steam is transferred through a series of pipes and eventually provides the power with which to turn the generator and make electricity.

Now, the generator and condenser, what is at the end of this facility and generates electricity gets very hot and they have to cool it down. So what most utilities will have to do is site this next to a large body of water, take the water and have it run past the condenser and dump it back out again. The only problem is that it raises the temperature of the water depending on how long it takes, two to eight days, and it changes the water so it is not the same when it goes back.

Environmentalists contend that if you change some of the structural biota, the fact that before you had an environmental circumstance where fish and plant life used to be, in the hot climate this circumstance would shift and change.

The utilities took ads saying that the fish are jumping and that they are making a warm climate for you to swim in, that sort of strategic focal point which has nothing to do with legal principles.

The citizens were concerned with so-called thermal pollution of Lake Michigan and with the fact that the normal operation of the Palisades plant would discharge into the atmosphere and Lake Michigan radioactive wastes greater than necessary or required by existing technology.

The Palisades case originally started after the group of fishermen went to see the utility to complain about the prospect of the hot water discharges. The utility's response to that meeting was to ask the fishermen to demonstrate to the utility that the hot water would harm Lake Michigan. The utility did not think it was its obligation to prove that no harm would result from its proposed plant and offered the uncomfortable assurance that if any damage to Lake Michigan developed, it would be repaired without, however, any clear indication of either how such damage would be detected or repaired.

The citizens, not delighted by this response, organized the surrounding homeowners and formed two makeshift groups. In addition they enlisted the support of the Sierra Club and two other national organizations, one of which had been instrumental in making trout fishing available in Lake Michigan. They convinced these organizations that the battle of Lake Michigan ought to commence and that the best way to proceed was to become parties to an administrative hearing which was to decide whether Consumers was to be given an operating license for the Palisades plant from the Atomic Energy Commission.

Before you build a nuclear power plant you must get a license from the Atomic Energy Commission. One of the problems is that the Atomic Energy Commission is not concerned with environmental protection. In other words, they view as their job nuclear and radiological protection. They are only interested in whether or not the plant is safe.

Although the Atomic Energy Commission had historically taken the position that environmental considerations divorced from questions of nuclear safety and radiological protection were not within its jurisdiction, the citizen groups intervened essentially to raise environmental issues.

When the Hearing Board ruled that we were not permitted to raise environmental evidence, the citizen groups decided they had two options: Permit the plant to be licensed and then raise the legal issue as to whether or not the Board was wrong in not permitting us to discuss environmental evidence. The other option was to play the game according to the rules of the Atomic Energy Commission and participate in the hearings.

We selected the second option hoping that during the process of the hearing sufficient momentum would be gained and we would be able to focus attention on some of the questions about the atomic power plant environmental prospects.

We stayed with the hearings for more than 45 hearing days which were spread over a period of six months. During the process of these hearings, the intervening groups were able to convince the Hearing Board that they were serious in their legal objectives and that they were not participating for any purposes of delay.

Although the citizen group's only demand of the utility at the beginning of the hearings was prevention of the discharge to Lake Michigan ofthe heated waters, the hearing raised issues of nuclear safety and radiological protection so that when eventually the utility agreed to negotiate, the lists of the intervening groups'demands had extended to the rerunning of certain safety tests and the installation of a new radioactive handling system which would eliminate releases of radioactivity to the atmosphere.

As an exercise in strategic action, the citizen groups used every imaginative and innovative method, in addition to participating in the hearing, to change the policy of the utility with respect to the protection of Lake Michigan.

First of all, when their original legal motions concerning environmental issues in the national environmental policy were overruled, the citizen groups took an emergency appeal to the Court of Appeals in Washington claiming that the Atomic Energy Commission was ignoring the National Environmental Policy Act.

Although the Court of Appeals told the citizen groups that the appropriate time to raise their issues was after the entire hearing was over, the Court of Appeals issued a very strong opinion which indicated to the citizen groups that their legal position on environmental matters was sound.

Each time during the hearing that adverse decisions were rendered by the Hearing Board, the environmentalists attempted to take the matter to the courts to demonstrate to the utility and the Atomic Energy Commission that the citizen groups were determined to see the matter through to conclusion.

During the legal process of the hearings and various appeals, much work was being done outside the hearing process. For example, the City of Kalamazoo, which was the place at which the hearings were held, was organized to educate the people of the importance of the hearing and enlist their financial and moral support.

We had two very big ads. One of them was a poster like announcing a play, and it was the Lake Michigan American Tragedy people versus Consumers Power much like a billing and trying to get people to come to the hearings.

Additionally, the citizen groups, by way of skillful use of the media, challenged and dispelled the myth, supported by the utility, that opposition from the environmentalists would result in blackouts or brownouts throughout the State of Michigan. As a matter of fact, through the process of public confrontation, the utility eventually retracted its position that there were imminent electrical shortages and that a crisis was near.

Moreover, because Kalamazoo had several colleges in the immediate area, the citizen groups helped formulate and organize an organization called CLEAN on the Western Michigan University campus to help in the public and non-legal campaign for the protection of Lake Michigan. The organization of the student group was important and very critical in hindsight, and as a matter of fact, today that student organization is an important factor in environmental considerations within the State of Michigan.

Additionally, and of equal importance was the entire question of scientific proof. Thus, even though the hearing would not permit us to discuss environmental questions, we thought it necessary in an effort to achieve credibility to find scientists who would agree with the environmental position taken by the intervening groups.

This effort was very difficult in that most, if not all of the leading scientists had worked for or were working for utilities and were uninterested in jeopardizing lucrative contracts.

Finally, one aquatic biologist agreed to help us. I went down there one afternoon, and it eventually came out that he was the lading consultant of Consumers. They invited him to develop a system to prevent the discharging. They kept paying him a monthly retainer. That afternoon I wrote John Bardoch's resignation. He quit the utility and went to help us.

Finally, the intervenors publicly and privately called in to question the responsibility of the administration of the State of Michigan over public utilities in an effort to have the Governor of Michigan help mediate the discharge outside the hearing process. I must admit of all the efforts of the environmentalists, the attempt to enlist the support of the Governor of Michigan was not successful in any positive manner, although I believe that our efforts helped to keep the Governor neutral and not take a position against the environmentalists.

In the end, the momentum of the citizen groups and their ability to withstand depreciation by the efforts of the utility and the Atomic Energy Commission made it economically prudent for the utility to sit down at the negotiating table with the citizen groups and recognize as a matter of policy considerations of environmental protection.

The actual agreement, which we signed on May 12, took more than three months to negotiate. The agreement required Consumers Power to install a closed circuit cooling system and a sophisticated radioactive circuit handling system to reduce radioactive discharges to the environment to essentially zero. In lay language, prior to the agreement, the utility was going to operate an open cycle cooling system discharging 390,000 gallons of water per minute, every minute, 24 hours a day. After the closed circuit system is built no heated water will be discharged into Lake Michigan.

Moreover, whereas prior to the agreement Consumers Power was permitted to release to the environment 100 percent of the limits of radioactive release allowed by the Atomic Energy Commission, Consumers is installing a system which restricts them under normal operating conditions from exceeding little more than zero of the Atomic Energy Commission's limits on radioactive releases.

The agreement, although ostensibly signed by the citizen groups and the utility in exchange for which the citizen groups agreed to withdraw from a hearing contesting the issuance of an operating permit for the Palisades plant has had significant effects.

Thus, the Atomic Energy Commission has agreed to enforce the more restrictive provisions contained in the agreement even though the Atomic Energy Commission took the position they were unnecessary.

The recently concluded four-state conference on Lake Michigan is in the process of passing a resolution requiring all other utilities which situate power plants on Lake Michigan to install cooling systems identical or better than the one contemplated by the Palisades agreement.

Since it has now been demonstrated that a power plant can be designed to reduce radioactive waste to initially zero, such demands are being made on other utilities and it is likely that all future power plants will contain such systems.

Illinois had declared that no more nuclear power plants should be situated on the shores of Lake Michigan, and it is unlikely that any utility will attempt to construct a nuclear power plant anywhere on Lake Michigan, whether in Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin or Michigan.

The Palisades experience offers substantial precedent to demonstrate that: Industry decisions which could adversely affect the environment can be challenged; government policies concerning environmental protection can be changed by citizen action; if a citizen action group has a valid environmental objective, the courts of the United States are open to them to even up the odds.

If some had asked me, the lawyer who handled the case a year ago, whether it was all possible, I don't know whether or not I would have answered in the affirmative. I now realize that citizen action groups can accomplish changes in national and state policy in connection with the protection of the environment if they persevere, are well organized, and are willing to see the issue to its conclusion.

And besides, it's fun.

Well, I would really appreciate if you have some questions about the strategic action we took in the Palisades hearing, whether in the hearing or outside the hearing.

A VOICE: At what stage in the construction of the Palisades plant did you become involved; the design stage?

MR. CHERRY: Well, the construction of the nuclear power plant was begun with little, if any, opposition. As a matter of fact, the public hearing which is required by law to take place in a construction hearing took six hours. When the plant was licensed for construction we were about 10 percent through with analyzing the thing. Our hearing took almost 45 days. You can see the difference between issues which are analyzed in an uncontested proceeding and a contested proceeding.

We got involved about four months before the operating proceedings was called and that was after the plant was built. I personally got involved with it the day before the hearing was started.

A VOICE: As a forerunner I would like to ask you your advice to other groups that might be involved with nuclear power plants. Would you perhaps outline the key stages and what people need to watch during the implementation, perhaps of land acquisitions, so they can get into it.

MR. CHERRY: Well, obviously, the earlier you get involved, the better. One of the difficulties with sites for nuclear power plants is whether or not a nuclear power plant ought to be built as opposed to a fossil fuel plant or requiring a particular utility to buy electricity from another utility which has a supply and not build a plant at all. These questions are a matter of policy and it's very difficult to change by any citizen action group, even if you get to see the President of the United States.

I think the Palisades case was open to change because in court you have to raise your hand and you have to tell the truth. Throughout the hearing the utility kept taking ads, but they never produced one witness who could be subjected to cross examination. When you are dealing with a utility, I am not so sure you are going to get anywhere.

I am now in another project in Michigan and we started four months in advance of the notice of hearing, and we are still preparing, and the hearing hasn't yet been set. We are in the process of just preparing ourselves.

There are circumstances of expertise. If you are going to attempt to stop a nuclear power plant, you must find yourself someone with nuclear experience and expertise. It's impossible to use the showman approach, not is it in my opinion wise. And I think the issue should be analyzed because on many issues the Atomic Energy Commission is wrong, and if it's called on to account in a court of law, it can be proved wrong.

We have been under the Atomic Energy Commission since 1954 and no one has ever challenged the Atomic Energy Commission's Madison Avenue publicity releases.

They said it is too complicated for me to understand. I spent four months at an administrative hearing on the Palisades plant and I have been involved, and it's not that difficult to understand. Scientists are not that very much different from any of us. It's not that complicated.

One of the other things that has been pointed out by Mr. Dunwoody's question is that in any kind of effort, if you are going to take a case to court you really have to be kind of imaginative in recognizing the kinds of pressures which any industrial organization or government organization will bow to. They have got plenty of money, so they are also willing to hire 25 lawyers, 10 nuclear engineers, and get together for playing the game in court. It is important to challenge them.

Earlier when the media was discussing this, one of the really significant things environmental groups like CAP are doing in Chicago right now is getting information and getting it out to the public. You don't have to start lawsuits to accomplish something.

You have got to be involved to be able to change something. It's fun and it's not hard at all.

MISS CANAVAN: I'd like to thank you all on behalf of SCOPE for coming and participating today in this seminar. I hope you got something out of it.

I'd like to ask you if you would fill out the questionnaire that we passed around, and if you have them filled out leave them on one of the tables outside the room, because we are toying with the idea of holding this type of seminar in other areas around the Great Lakes Region, and we would like to know what you thought about it. I'd like to ask you to keep in contact with SCOPE. The address is on the posters hanging outside. I work as the SCOPE coordinator; my name is Mary Canavan, and you can get in touch with me in that office.

As soon as we receive copies of the transcript of this proceeding, we will send a copy to each one of you that attended this course. You will be able to use it and pass it on.

You will notice we have quite a few cameras around here and we are having this put on tape. We are having this made into a 16-millimeter film and it will be available to groups.

Thank you.

(Which were all the proceedings had in the above-entitled matter.)

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1971—750-057